



Who Shall Meet the Foe If Not She? Womenâ€™s Participation in the Movement Leading Up to the Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906, As Seen Through the Pages of Good Housekeeping

Citation

Who Shall Meet the Foe If Not She? Womenâ€™s Participation in the Movement Leading Up to the Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906, As Seen Through the Pages of Good Housekeeping (2002 Third Year Paper)

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:8889492>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

**Who Shall Meet the Foe If Not She? Women's Participation in the
Movement Leading Up to the Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906,
As Seen Through the Pages of *Good Housekeeping***

Jenny Ann Diamond '02
Food and Drug Law (Winter 2001)
Third Year Paper

May 2002

**Who Shall Meet the Foe If Not She? Women's Participation in the
Movement Leading Up to the Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906, As Seen**

Through the Pages of *Good Housekeeping*

Abstract

This paper examines women's participation in the movement leading up to the Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906 through a close reading of Good Housekeeping magazine between the years 1885 and 1907. The piece offers a lengthy chronological overview of Good Housekeeping's coverage of the problems of food adulteration and misbranding. Not only did the magazine campaign for state and national legislation, but it instituted its own certification system for pure foods as well. The paper also explores Good Housekeeping's relationships with other actors in the pure food, drink, and drug movement, including women's clubs, temperance advocates, and Harvey Wiley. Articles and editorials in Good Housekeeping illustrate various themes emphasized by women pure food reformers, such as moralism, faith in science, and the idea that pure food was uniquely a woman's issue. This paper suggests that Good Housekeeping's longstanding interest in the problems of pure food, drink, and drugs lends credence to historians who argue that women were a vital part of the campaign for a federal law from the very beginning.

On June 30, 1906, Congress passed the first national law regulating the purity of food and drugs, and President Theodore Roosevelt signed it on the same day.¹ The Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906² prohibited the manufacture of adulterated and misbranded foods and drugs in the United States territories and the District of Columbia, and more significantly, it forbade their introduction into interstate commerce throughout the country.³ First-time violators were subject to fines, and repeat offenders could be imprisoned for up to a year.⁴ The Bureau of Chemistry of the Department of Agriculture was charged with examining and testing suspicious products.⁵

Although the law's critics – both at the time and in subsequent years – lamented that the statute failed to specify standards for adulteration, thereby effectively leaving the Department of Agriculture to battle it out with individual manufacturers in the courts,⁶ the 1906 Act was a landmark in the history of American food and drug law. Indeed, its passage was the culmination of decades of effort. In 1879, Hendrick B. Wright, a Democratic congressman from Pennsylvania, had introduced the first general bill seeking to prohibit the adulteration of food and drink throughout the nation.⁷ The law died in committee, but between 1879 and 1906, one hundred and ninety different pure food and drug bills were introduced into Congress.⁸

And the issue of pure food only arrived on the national stage after years of battles on the state level. Illinois was the first state to pass a pure food law, in 1874.⁹ New York enacted what would later be considered a

¹JAMES HARVEY YOUNG, *PURE FOOD: SECURING THE FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUGS ACT OF 1906* 262 (1989). Congress also simultaneously passed – and Roosevelt signed – the Meat Inspection Amendment, which expanded Federal meat regulation. *Id.*

²Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906, 34 Stat. 768 (repealed 1938).

³*Id.* § 2.

⁴*Id.*

⁵*Id.* § 4.

⁶*See, e.g.*, YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 266.

⁷YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 50.

⁸MITCHELL OKUN, *FAIR PLAY IN THE MARKETPLACE: THE FIRST BATTLE FOR PURE FOOD AND DRUGS* 3 (1986).

⁹LORINE SWAINSTON GOODWIN, *THE PURE FOOD, DRINK, AND DRUG CRUSADERS* 68 (1999).

landmark pure food statute in 1881, and many other states followed.¹⁰

¹⁰ *Id.*

Perhaps more than any other issue of the time – with the probable exception of temperance – the pure food, drink, and drug movement captured the interest, attention, and imagination of late-nineteenth century American women. Women, individually and in clubs, pressured officials to enforce existing laws, lobbied for more stringent legislation, and did the best they could to buy safe and healthy food for their families.

This paper analyzes women's participation in the campaign for a national pure food and drug law from 1885 to 1907 through a close reading of *Good Housekeeping* magazine.¹¹ There are several reasons for this approach. First, although many scholars have stressed the importance of general-interest magazines and newspapers – especially the so-called “muckrakers” – in fostering public sentiment for a federal pure food bill, they have paid less attention to publications directed towards women. And even those historians who have examined women's magazines have focused on other ones, such as *Ladies' Home Journal* and *Women's Home Companion*.¹² This paper therefore seeks to add to the body of original-source research about the pure food, drink, and drug movement, especially with respect to women's involvement.

Second, *Good Housekeeping's* coverage of the pure food issue neatly illustrates many of the contours and themes of the pure food, drink, and drug movement more generally. From that angle, this paper is a case study, examining a broad social movement by concentrating on one of its manifestations.

Finally, this paper tries to contribute, however marginally, to the energetic debate among historians about which entity or entities deserve primary credit for the passage of the Federal Food and Drug Law of 1906. The research presented here, which suggests that women readers of *Good Housekeeping*, at least, were extremely interested in the pure food issue as early as 1885, lends credence to the theory that women, rather than being pulled in by male leaders in the early 1900s, were important agents throughout the long campaign for national pure food legislation.

Part I of this paper offers some background about *Good Housekeeping* and the social climate in which it began publishing. Part II is a lengthy chronological overview of the magazine's coverage of the pure food, drink, and drug issue. Part II is divided into five sections, in accordance with this author's theory that *Good Housekeeping's* treatment of the issue breaks down¹⁴ into five reasonably discrete stages. Part III explores *Good Housekeeping's* relationship to other major actors in the pure food, drink, and drug movement, including women's clubs, temperance advocates, and famed reformer Harvey Wiley. Part IV examines various themes in the pure food movement. Part V addresses the question of credit for the Federal Food and Drug Law of

I. GOOD HOUSEKEEPING AND THE IDEOLOGY OF DOMESTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Good Housekeeping published its first issue in January of 1885. The magazine began as a biweekly, and its early issues – printed on thin paper of about ten by twelve inches – look to a modern reader more like a newspaper or tabloid than like a current-day magazine. In 1891 *Good Housekeeping* moved to a monthly publication schedule and a more magazine-like format (printed on glossy, slightly smaller pages), both of which it has retained to the present day.

Good Housekeeping presented itself as a guide for the modern, intelligent woman, for whom housework was not mindless drudgery, but rather an intellectually and morally demanding vocation. The magazine’s full title was: “*Good Housekeeping: Conducted in the Interests of the Higher Life of the Household*, and it stressed the social importance and moral virtue of careful housekeeping and devoted motherhood. Often written in lofty, flowery language, the myriad articles included essays on household management, marriage, and parenting; recipes; instructions on caring for the sick;¹³ and a substantial amount of poetry. The editors also reprinted numerous short excerpts from other publications that they thought would interest their readers. Judging from the number of articles about the “servant problem,” the magazine targeted middle- and upper-middle-class married women with children. However, this point should not be overstated; *Good Housekeeping* also often ran pieces about how to live pleasantly and cheaply in a rooming-house or a small apartment shared with other women. The common theme was the virtue, and challenge, of good housekeeping.

It is worth noting that the rise of home economics magazines like *Good Housekeeping* during the latter half of the nineteenth century were part of a broader social phenomenon. Scholars of women’s history have described the sharpened division between gender spheres that accompanied industrialization in the

¹³See, e.g., *How to Help in Sickness and Accident: With Help That Shall Be Something More than a Hindrance*, 1 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 28, 1885, at 51 (discussing stroke & apoplexy).

early 1800s.¹⁴ As more men began working outside the home, women assumed greater responsibility for child care and housekeeping, and less responsibility for supporting the family economically, than had their predecessors.¹⁵ This shift was initially limited to the upper classes, but over the course of the century, as increasing numbers of middle-class men were able to earn enough money to support their wives, the social space between the genders widened.¹⁶ These economic and societal changes were, in turn, reinforced by what Karen Blair calls the “ideal lady ideology”¹⁷ and what Barbara Leslie Epstein calls the “ideology of femininity”:¹⁸

The central elements of this ideology were, first, that children required full-time, undivided adults’ attention; second, that women were especially endowed to provide this care (and to create the homes that their husbands needed as well); and finally, that domesticity would shield

women from the evil of the outside world and bring them status and power, mediated through their families.¹⁹

Magazines such as *Ladies’ Home Journal*, *Food and Drink: A Magazine for Bright Housekeepers*, *American Kitchen Magazine*, *The Mother at Home and Household Magazine*, and *Good Housekeeping* exemplified and disseminated this ideology of domestic achievement.

¹⁴See, e.g., BARBARA LESLIE EPSTEIN, *THE POLITICS OF DOMESTICITY: WOMEN, EVANGELISM, AND TEMPERANCE IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY AMERICA* 77 – 79 (1981).

¹⁵*Id.* at 79.

¹⁶KAREN J. BLAIR, *THE CLUBWOMAN AS FEMINIST: TRUE WOMAN HOOD REDEFINED, 1868-1914* 2 (1980).

¹⁷*Id.* at 1 – 3.

¹⁸EPSTEIN, *supra* note 14, at 80 – 85.

¹⁹*Id.* at 81.

II.

The Pure Food, Drink, and Drug Movement in the Pages of

GOOD HOUSEKEEPING

A. January 1885 – July 1894: Food Safety in the Kitchen

By 1885, when *Good Housekeeping* published its first issue, the problem of pure food, drink, and drugs had already been in the public consciousness for some time. Historians debate whether the quality of food and drugs actually deteriorated after the Civil War or whether it was simply that methods of detecting food adulteration improved,²⁰ but everyone agrees that beginning in the early 1870s, Americans were increasingly concerned about the quality of their food supply, the purity of alcoholic beverages, and the safety of so-called proprietary or patent medicines.

From early 1885 to mid-1893, *Good Housekeeping* regularly published articles about food adulteration. Usually short in length and moderate in tone, these pieces sought to educate readers about food adulteration in the marketplace. More specifically, articles in these early years concentrated on harmful foods and drinks, such as those adulterated with unhealthy products or produced under unsanitary conditions. Worries about misrepresentation or misbranding would come later. During this first period, there were few calls for political involvement; the magazine focused simply on informing readers about what sorts of products were safe and what were not.

In the September 18, 1886, the magazine ran a full-page article detailing the extent of unwholesome and adulterated foods. Summarizing an article by Dr. Cyrus Edson that had been published in *The Forum*, the

²⁰ Compare Goodwin, *supra* note 9, at 41 (suggesting that food, drink, and drugs rapidly declined in quality after 1871), with Okun, *supra* note 8, at 15 (noting that “[o]ne historian of food adulteration has questioned whether food adulteration truly increased....or whether ‘the rise of modern chemistry’ merely made these frauds more visible.”).

unnamed author described how unscrupulous milk dealers added water and dangerous preservatives to their product, and she warned readers about the hazards of milk and meat from sick, poorly-fed cows. Candy was adulterated with terra alba, kaolin, starch, finely-ground marble dust and pulverized asbestos; jellies, coffee, tea, mustard, vermicelli, bread, and margarine were all contaminated with harmful ingredients. The author concluded: “In short, says Dr. Edson, every beverage we drink and nearly every food we eat is liable to be made a source of danger to us by the ignorant and dishonest.”²¹

The quality of the milk supply was apparently of great concern to *Good Housekeeping* readers. In September 1887, an editorial noted the hazards associated with milk during the summertime.²² In New York City, milk was at least thirty-six hours old by the time city milk distributors received it, and milk sold in groceries was considerably older. According to experts, milk more than forty-eight hours old was dangerous. A short paragraph in the November 1887 issue reported that a Buffalo, NY milk peddler was convicted under state law after selling milk adulterated with water, despite his claim that the original dealer had adulterated the milk without the peddler’s knowledge.²³ In November 1890, the magazine explained how to detect watered-down milk: the housewife should pour it into a tall bottle and let it sit for forty-eight hours; if the milk is adulterated, the water and milk will separate.²⁴ And a 1893 piece warned of the dangers faced by English milk consumers: “In the golden age our forefathers were content to use water for the strengthening the milk; now it is adulterated with rice flour and pounded bullocks’ and calves’ brains, and slightly sweetened with a saccharine substance.”²⁵

Candy – which would later warrant its own subsection in the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906²⁶ – was also a problem. A February 18, 1888 article entitled “Poison in Candy” warned that some candy flavorings

²¹ *Poisons in Food and Drink: Lurking Dangers Bred by Ignorance, Carelessness and Dishonesty*, 3 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Sept. 18, 1896, at 235.

²² *Editorial*, 5 Good Housekeeping, Sept. 17, 1887, at 246.

²³ *The Family Scrap Basket: Interesting Bits of Household Fact and Fancy*, 6 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 12, 1887, at iv.

²⁴ *To Detect Adulteration of Milk*, 11 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 8, 1890, at ii. (from *Hall’s Journal of Health*).

²⁵ *How Food is Adulterated in England*, 16 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1893, at xiv (from *The London Pall Mall Gazette*).

²⁶ Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906, 34 Stat. 768, at § 7.

contained prussic acid and fusel oil, both extremely dangerous, as well as less dangerous but still harmful elements like rancid butter, wood alcohol, and oil of vitriol. The author warned readers: “Beware of the very cheap candies. Goods can be so cheap that the suspicion is warranted that something is wrong about them.”²⁷ Similarly, a short 1886 piece explained how consumers could distinguish pure and adulterated chocolate.²⁸

Hazards were also found in cheese; the October 11, 1890 issue reported that eight members of a Cleveland family were dangerously ill after eating contaminated cheese.²⁹ And an April 1893 article criticized fruit growers for selling unripe fruit, which was suspected to cause cholera. The author praised the Delaware farmers’ institute for trying to suppress the sale of immature fruit.³⁰

Although these early issues of *Good Housekeeping* focused on dangerous, rather than merely deceptive, food adulterations, it did devote some attention to the problem of food adulteration with physically harmless substances. Spices and coffee were the main culprits. In 1887, three different articles warned of widespread adulteration of spices. A November 1887 editorial noted that the chemists at the United States Department of Agriculture had concluded that “no food is so much adulterated as spices.”³¹ In a separate piece, the magazine made a rare – at this time – call for legislation to protect the purity of spices: “It is quite possible to stop all this adulteration, which now amounts to over 80 per cent, if proper legislation can be effected in all the States. At present Canada, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and Michigan alone have laws which are of value.”³²

²⁷ *Poison in Candy*, 6 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Feb. 18, 1888, at 193.

²⁸ *Business Comment*, 4 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 27, 1886, at ii.

²⁹ *Deadly Tyrotoxicon in Cheese*, 11 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 11, 1890 (from *Cleveland Plaindealer*).

³⁰ Newton Morton, *A Cholera Food: A Plea for Well-Matured Fruit*, April 1893, at 169.

³¹ *Deception in Food*, 6 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 26, 1887, at 45; see also *Crumbs from Everybody’s Table: Swept up and Carefully Preserved*, 5 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 28, 1887, at ii (“There is more adulteration, [a gentleman] told me, than in anything else, and the making of the adulterating agents is a business in itself.”).

³² *Dilution of Spices*, 5 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 1, 1887, at 272.

The question of coffee adulteration was more complicated. On the one hand, writers agreed that fake and adulterated coffee – especially that adulterated with chicory – was widespread. A January 18, 1890 piece warned that wild orange berries were being substituted for coffee. The author observed, philosophically: “One bright gleam on the coffee horizon is in the fact that the new berry will be so cheap that it will, if its culture succeeds, drive out chicory, and as an adulterant it is said to be much less vile than that staple coffee cheapener.”³³ Two months later, the magazine reported that New York wholesalers were selling fake coffee beans, made of flour, water, and a mucilage-like substance.³⁴

On the other hand, a couple of writers dismissed concerns about coffee adulteration, noting that even if coffee was generally adulterated, the adulterants were not harmful. The April 1893 issue commented: “The worst which can be said is that when [chicory] masquerades as coffee it is sailing under false colors, and probably costing the consumer more than it ought.”³⁵ Another author went so far as to suggest that coffee adulteration was actually a good thing, because chicory was less harmful – especially for “the very nervous” – than coffee itself.³⁶

It should be noted that although *Good Housekeeping* was clearly interested in the problem of food adulteration, it was anything but sensationalistic during this first stage. The magazine prided itself on a modern, scientific approach to housekeeping, and it embraced what it saw as welcome innovations in the food industry.³⁷ Most significantly, *Good Housekeeping* repeatedly stressed the safety of canned goods, a controversial position that it would retain even in later years, when its pure food rhetoric became more heated.

By way of background, it is useful to know that the canned food industry boomed during and after the Civil

³³*Bogus Coffee*, 10 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 18, 1890, at iv (from *The New York Sun*).

³⁴*Bogus Coffee*, 10 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 1, 1890, (from *Pennsylvania Grocer*).

³⁵A Lover of Coffee, *A Fresh Cup of Coffee: Some Suggestions about its Composition, Preparation, and Service*, 16 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, April 1893, at 162.

³⁶*Coffee Adulteration*, 5 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Aug. 20, 1887, at 191.

³⁷See *infra* IV.B.

War.³⁸ Scientists disagreed about the safety of canned foods. Some argued that people who became ill after eating canned foods had been poisoned by “ptomaines,” or nitrogen compounds from putrefaction.³⁹ In contrast, the Bureau of Chemistry for the Department of Agriculture issued a report in 1893 suggesting that the greatest danger from canned foods was the lead used to solder can seams and tops, which dissolved in food acids.⁴⁰ The report maintained that the copper and zinc used to preserve the color of green vegetables, as well as the tin and lead in can plating, were also hazardous.⁴¹

However, *Good Housekeeping* firmly insisted that canned foods were safe. In the November 28, 1887 issue, an author explained that canned meats were only poisoned if they were poisoned before canning: The only metal that may cause poisoning in the case of these foods is lead, and this is as unlikely as the falling of a meteor on your head.⁴² Another writer stressed the special benefit of inexpensive, canned foods for poor consumers, who could not afford fresh, in-season luxury foods.⁴³ An August 18, 1888 writer was even more vehement:

It is nothing but newspaper sensationalism that has led people into believing that canned foods are dangerous to health. The tin plate is not acted upon by any ordinary acids or gases

of decomposition. The only poisoning that has been caused by these foods is due to the ignorance of the consumer; they open a can, let the contents begin the process of fermentation or putrefaction, by which the ptomaine [sic] poisons are developed and these are of deadly character. These foods are perfectly safe, in the hands of a person of ordinary care and intelligence.⁴⁴

Similarly, *Good Housekeeping* initially came down on the side of “progress” with regard to the impassioned controversy over oleomargarine. The invention of oleomargarine, and the response of the dairy industry, was one of the major battles of the pure food and drug era.⁴⁵ In a lengthy article in the May 1894 issue, *Good*

³⁸YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 106 – 113.

³⁹*Id.* at 110 – 11.

⁴⁰*Id.* at 110.

⁴¹*Id.*

⁴²*Why Canned Meats Poison*, 6 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 26, 1887, at 38.

⁴³*History and Healthfulness of Canned Foods*, 3 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Aug. 21, 1886, at 200 (“The preparation of food in this way has been an especial blessing to the poor man, enabling him and his family to enjoy at all seasons little luxuries before entirely beyond his means, while to all it affords a variety of diet impossible to obtain under any other system.”).

⁴⁵For a detailed discussion of the development of oleomargarine and the controversies it engendered, see YOUNG, *supra* note

Housekeeping lauded oleomargarine and the industry that produced it.⁴⁶ Adopting the term preferred by the oleo interests, “butterine,” the author praised oleomargarine factories for their high hygienic standards and their apparent openness to inspection: “Any one is at liberty to watch the manufacture of butterine, and he is not asked whether he is an advocate or an enemy of the product.”⁴⁷ The article presented assorted testimony to the effect that oleomargarine was completely healthful, and it concluded: “A great deal of the opposition to butterine has come from the farmers, and those supposed to represent their interests; but it will be seen that butterine is as much an agricultural product as butter itself, while by the widening of the field from which the ingredients are drawn, it really broadens the range of industry.”⁴⁸

During these early years, *Good Housekeeping* rarely delved into any sort of political commentary. In the context of the pure food issue, the magazine seldom urged government action. Rather, *Good Housekeeping* suggested that it was up to the individual housewife to protect her family. The magazine often explained how to detect adulteration in various products, such as candy,⁴⁹ milk,⁵⁰ and meat.⁵¹ For several years, Mrs. F.A. Benson wrote a regular column, “Table Supplies and Economies: What to Buy, When to Buy, and How to Buy Wisely and Well, detailing the various meat, dairy, and produce items available month-to-month in the New York food market, their level of quality, and the appropriate price ranges for each.”⁵² Despite the fact that the food supply was adulterated at all price levels,⁵³ *Good Housekeeping* repeatedly warned

1, at 71 – 94.

⁴⁶‘Bread and Butter,’ or ‘Butterine’: *Butter Made of Cream, and Butterine of What? The Question Practically Considered*, 18 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1894, at 231 – 2.

⁴⁷*Id.* at 231.

⁴⁸*Id.* at 232.

⁴⁹*See supra* p. 8.

⁵⁰*See supra* p. 7.

⁵¹*See, e.g., How to Know Good Meat*, 5 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, July 9, 1887, at 126 (describing what diseased or substandard meat looks, feels, and smells like); *Marketing for Mutton and Pork*, 5 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Aug. 6, 1887, at 169.

⁵²The column began in the February 6, 1886 issue, under the title, “Report of the Food Market of New York. After a brief hiatus in early 1887, it restarted in an expanded form and under a new title.

⁵³Lorine Swainston Goodwin asserts that “[a]t first, reformers thought the threat fell almost entirely on the uneducated poor, who in order to survive, were forced to buy food that had been cheapened by adulteration.” However, studies showed that “adulteration extended to almost every item of food on the American dinner table; regardless of cost, beverage adulteration was more insidious than commonly suspected, and no commercial medication could be considered safe.” GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 41.

housewives not to skimp on food expenses. One especially vehement column in the March 16, 1889 issue claimed: “To use low-priced stuff for food is not only extravagant and foolish, but criminal. It is a flagrant violation of the laws of physiology and hygiene, and a reckless defiance of disease and death. Beware of low-priced articles of food.”⁵⁴

B. August 1894 – October 1900: Growing Interest and Greater Politicization

In August 1894, *Good Housekeeping* announced that it would be printing a series of papers on “The Food Question.” The magazine’s readers apparently greeted the prospect with enthusiasm; the September issue claimed that “[s]pace will not admit of printing, in this issue, all of the commendatory notices and favorable comments that have come to us.”⁵⁵

This series marked a shift to a new stage of *Good Housekeeping*’s coverage of the pure food, drink, and drugs issue. From August 1894 to late 1900, the magazine’s articles about pure food were generally longer and more detailed than they had been previously. What’s more, although the overall tone was still largely apolitical, several pieces called for government action, especially the enforcement of existing pure food laws. A number of *Good Housekeeping* authors maintained that the problem of dangerous foods had waned in recent years. George K. Holmes, a “prominent official of the Census Office,” writing in October 1894, praised improvements in the meat supply, suggesting that there was little evidence of disease in American

⁵⁴ *Cheap Food*, 8 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 16, 1889, at ii. For another example, see *Guard Against Adulteration*, 3 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Sept. 18, 1886, at 250) (“A housekeeper will avoid some adulterated articles by buying food as near the unmanufactured state as possible – pepper in the berry, coffee unground, honey in the comb, fruits for jellies – and by always buying the best. Don’t be enticed into buying an inferior article because the price is low.”).

⁵⁵ 19 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Sept. 1894, at 131 – 32.

meat at the time.⁵⁶ One month later, J. Brewster Sedgewick, M.D., asserted that there was comparatively little adulteration in American milk: “[i]n nearly all parts of the country, even in the largest cities, pure milk is the rule rather than the exception.”⁵⁷

However, adulteration with harmless but deceptive substances continued. Mr Holmes noted that general food adulteration was still widespread, and James S. Molineaux, M.D. maintained that adulteration of spices remained a problem, although the severity of the problem had declined along with the reduction in spice prices.⁵⁸ A May 1898 article reporting on the Department of Agriculture’s recent investigation of the flour industry suggested that ten to twenty-five percent of all wheat flour was adulterated with corn meal or corn starch.⁵⁹

In contrast to those in *Good Housekeeping*’s early years, articles in this second stage demonstrated a greater faith in government action. The general sentiment was that pure food laws could be effective if stringently enforced. Dr. Sedgewick attributed the improvement in the milk supply to the diligent application of strict laws.⁶⁰ Mrs. H.M. Plunkett, writing in December 1894, agreed, but she vigorously stressed the necessity of constant enforcement: “It is certain that the inspection of the boards of health are a deterrent to frauds that the general public scarcely appreciate. The state analysts, with their polariscopes and microscopes are a terror to evil doers.”⁶¹ The purity of the milk supply was absolutely contingent on government action: “With the establishment of boards of health, the aid of law was invoked to put a stop to these unrighteous practices [milk adulteration], and it is the concurrent testimony of inspectors everywhere that the moment their vigilance relaxes the adulteration curve climbs up again, and that the milk traffic is just as inherently

⁵⁶George K. Holmes, *Uncle Sam and the Food Question*, 19 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 1894, at 153 – 5.

⁵⁷J. Brewster Sedgewick, *Milk and Its Products: Their Preparation and Use as Food: Some Contrasts Between Old Methods and the Present: I.—Milk, Natural and Condensed*, 19 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1894, at 197 – 98.

⁵⁸James S. Molineaux, *Condiments and Spices: Their Use, Abuse, and Adulteration*, 20 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Apr. 1895, at 150.

⁵⁹*The Adulteration of Wheat Flour: By the Introduction of ‘Corn Meal’ and Other Adulterants, No. II*, 26 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1898, at 190 – 93.

⁶⁰Sedgewick, *supra* note 57, at 197 – 98.

⁶¹H.M. Plunkett, *The Effort to Procure Pure Foods*, 19 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1894, at 242.

destitute of the essence of the ten commandments now, as ever.”⁶² The same was true, she asserted, for the meat industry: “The community is roused on the subject, and the law is taking cognizance of the fact, that you have no more rights to fill a man’s blood with tubercles than you have to put shot into some of his vital parts. Vigilance! vigilance! vigilance! must be the cry.”⁶³

Other writers lauded the efforts of federal and state officers. Mr. Holmes credited the Department of Agriculture with the improvement of the meat supply.⁶⁴ Another author, writing about butter, noted that “[t]he United States government is certainly doing all that could be expected from its officials toward protecting the people from imposition in the matter of substitutes for butter.”⁶⁵ Similarly, a writer in the May 1896 issue commented: “To the credit of the various branches of our government, municipal, state, and national, it may be said that [food adulteration is banned], and that the deceit which unquestionably exists in large degree, does so in violation of law and in defiance of all public sentiment.”⁶⁶

But not all *Good Housekeeping* contributors were satisfied. The author of the wheat flour piece suggested that few states enforced their anti-adulteration laws “with sufficient vigor.”⁶⁷ And there were several calls for stronger or broader laws. Most conservatively, an 1898 piece called for stronger laws against candy adulteration, because the substances commonly added to candy were harmful.⁶⁸ Other authors were bolder, urging consumer protection against not only harmful adulterations, but also fraud. A short piece on maple syrup noted that Indianapolis city officials were unable to arrest manufacturers and vendors of fraudulently

⁶²*Id.* at 240.

⁶³*Id.* at 241.

⁶⁴Holmes, *supra* note 56, at 153.

⁶⁵*No Deceit in Butter*, 23 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, July 1896, at 25.

⁶⁶*What We Eat*, 22 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1896, at 224.

⁶⁷*The Adulteration of Wheat Flour*, *supra* note 59, at 191.

⁶⁸*For Candy Mongers*, 26 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Feb. 1898, at 71, 72 (“These adulterations are almost invariably of a class to endanger the health of those partaking freely, and there should be strong laws, unsparingly enforced, against them.”).

labeled fake maple syrup because state law apparently prohibited only adulteration with harmful products.⁶⁹ In 1895, another writer praised a Massachusetts law that prohibited coloring oleomargarine to look like butter, but added that it should also be illegal to color butter to appear higher-grade.⁷⁰ Perhaps the most radical suggestion came from Mr. Holmes, who – heralding the future – argued that recent findings of widespread adulteration “emphasize the necessity of some national law by which the exportation of adulterated articles of food from one state to another can be prevented.”⁷¹

C. *November 1900 – September 1901: Worries About Misbranding,
and Early Hints of a Political Movement*

The next turning point in *Good Housekeeping*’s coverage of the pure food, drug, and drink issue came in November 1900, when the magazine announced an upcoming series of articles about adulterated food.⁷² For the first time, *Good Housekeeping* officially endorsed political action on behalf of pure food:

To declare war against dishonest food, whether adulterated or making any false pretense whatsoever, is one of the prime objects of *Good Housekeeping*.... The campaign in behalf of pure food laws has fairly begun, but like other great reforms it moves slowly. To give it a tremendous push by opening the eyes of our American families to the present condition of things is a part of our mission.⁷³

⁶⁹ *How Fake Maple Sirup is Made*, 24 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1897, at x (from *The Indianapolis Sentinel*).

⁷⁰ *The Battle of Butter*, 20 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1895, at 218.

⁷¹ Holmes, *supra* note 56, at 154.

⁷² *Dishonest Food*, 31 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1900, at 272.

From November 1900 to September 1901, *Good Housekeeping* increasingly recognized two important elements of the pure food campaign: first, misbranding was as serious a problem as was adulteration; and second, there was a real need for greater government attention to the issue of pure food.

Two articles in the December 1900 issue, both about oleomargarine, demonstrate a keener awareness of the problem of misbranding. Indeed, as *Good Housekeeping* became less concerned with dangerous foods and more worried about mislabeling, it departed somewhat from its earlier pro-oleomargarine stance. Milton B. Marks investigated rumors that oleo oil was made from garbage and horse fat, with ultimately inconclusive results. However, he cited a member of the Illinois state food commission to the effect that the real problem was oleomargarine being sold as butter; the Chicago city chemist said that half of the “butter” brought to him for inspection turned out to be oleomargarine.⁷⁴ An editorial in the same issue praised a bill currently pending in Congress that would lower the two-cent tax on oleomargarine to 1/10 cent per pound for uncolored and labeled oleo, and raise the tax to ten cents per pound for oleomargarine colored to imitate butter. The author noted: “There is at present a vast consumption of oleomargarine by people who suppose they are using butter. This is rank injustice to the consumer and to the dairying industry.”⁷⁵

A lengthy April 1901 article by the prominent pure food advocate Ella Morris Kretschmar stressed the need for government action.⁷⁶ Ms. Kretschmar criticized the quality of modern cornmeal, the preparation of which lengthened its shelf life but also dramatically lessened its nutritional value.⁷⁷ She sharply criticized the lack of adequate state intervention, charging: Our material possessions are guarded, at vast expense, by

⁷⁴Milton B. Marks, *The True Inwardness of Oleomargarine*, 31 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, at 324 – 27.

⁷⁵*Bogus Butter Exposed*, 31 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1900, at 330.

⁷⁶Ella Morris Kretschmar, *The Corn Meal Grievance, and Some Recipes*, 32 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Apr. 1901, at 308 – 10.

⁷⁷*Id.* at 309.

the ‘strong arm of the law,’ while the grosser robbery of our bodies’ nutrition, of our very mental integrity, is permitted to go unchecked and unpunished.”⁷⁸

The other significant development during this stage was the creation of the Good Housekeeping Institute, an organization that would subsequently play an important role in the pure food, drink, and drugs movement. In February 1901, *Good Housekeeping* announced that it was setting up a clearinghouse for information about housekeeping. The Institute would initially have two main functions: creating a “domestic service inquiry” for potential employers and employees; and promoting the establishment of cooking schools.⁷⁹

D. October 1901 – September 1905: “Enlist[ing] for the War”

In October 1901, Good Housekeeping made a landmark declaration. It announced that it was launching a campaign for a national pure food law. In an editorial entitled, “A Campaign for Pure Foods: How Every Individual, Family, and Organization May Promote This Great Work,” the magazine argued that current food inspection laws were ineffective: “What is needed is an enactment by congress of a comprehensive PURE FOOD LAW, to be enforced by competent officials in cooperation with the state food inspectors.”⁸⁰ Readers were urged to write in for a packet of information about how to participate in the campaign. “Good Housekeeping,” the editors claimed, “has ‘enlisted for the war.’”⁸¹

⁷⁸*Id.*

⁷⁹*The Good Housekeeping Institute*, 32 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Feb. 1901, at 142.

⁸⁰A Campaign for Pure Foods: How Every Individual, Family, and Organization May Promote This Great Work, 33 Good Housekeeping, Oct. 1901, at 338.

⁸¹*Id.*

Between October 1901 and August 1905, *Good Housekeeping* established itself as a mainstay of the pure food movement. The magazine published lengthy articles on adulteration and misbranding, frequent updates on developments in state and federal governments, and repeated calls for readers to join the campaign for a national pure food law.

The magazine itself made an institutional commitment to pure food efforts. In February 1902, *Good Housekeeping* created the Department of Pure Foods within the Good Housekeeping Institute.⁸² The Department's functions were described as follows:

"It is proposed to arouse public sentiment in behalf of pure food legislation by congress, so that all food products designed for interstate commerce, or for export, may be guaranteed as to purity and quality by federal inspection."⁸³

Moreover, *Good Housekeeping* stressed that it would not accept advertisement from manufacturers it considered unreliable or untrustworthy.⁸⁴ In April 1902, the magazine announced that it would refund money to consumers who found that any advertised product was unacceptable.⁸⁵ As of April 1903, *Good Housekeeping* had made only two refunds.⁸⁶

The magazine offered regular updates on pure food efforts in state and federal legislatures. During 1902, Massachusetts,⁸⁷ New Jersey,⁸⁸ and North Dakota⁸⁹ passed or expanded pure food laws, and Minnesota,

⁸² *Good Housekeeping Institute: Co-operative Effort That Promises Much for Practical Work*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Feb. 1902, at 154 – 55.

⁸³ *Id.* at 154.

⁸⁴ 'Thou Shalt Not Steal', 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1902, at 374.

⁸⁵ *Our Guarantee: Of the Reliability of Our Advertisers, and How it Has Worked During Its First Year*, 36 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Apr. 1903, at 386. This author was unable to locate the original announcement of this policy.

⁸⁶ *Id.* *Good Housekeeping* maintains both of these policies today. The magazine publishes only those advertisements approved by the Good Housekeeping Institute. See *About the Good Housekeeping Institute: The Good Housekeeping Institute*, <http://magazines.ivillage.com/goodhousekeeping/consumer/institute/articles/0,12873,284511.290570,00.html>. Under the aegis of its Seal of Approval program, *Good Housekeeping* also offers refunds to certain approved products that prove defective within the first two years of purchase. See *About the Good Housekeeping Institute: What's Behind the Good Housekeeping Seal*, <http://magazines.ivillage.com/goodhousekeeping/consumer/institute/articles/0,12873,284511.290570-2,00.html>.

⁸⁷ 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Feb. 1902, at 155; *The Pure Food Campaign*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Sept. 1902, at 205.

⁸⁸ *Two New Pure Food Laws*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 1902, at 264.

⁸⁹ *Id.*

Wisconsin, California, and Washington considered such legislation.⁹⁰ And various bills continued to be introduced into Congress.⁹¹

Good Housekeeping continued to stress that not only dangerous adulteration, but also mislabeling and adulteration with nonharmful substances, were serious problems. A December 1901 article suggested that certain household products, like flour and sugar, were rarely adulterated, things like milk and ground coffee were frequently adulterated, and products such as spices and jellies were almost always adulterated.⁹² The author maintained that most adulterants were not harmful to the consumer's health – with the exception of chemical preservatives – but that they were nonetheless fraudulent.⁹³ In May 1902, Albert H. Welles sharply criticized the widespread practice of mislabeling; he noted that some reputable manufacturers manufactured substandard goods under false names.⁹⁴ Two articles in the October 1902 issue addressed the problem: A report on congressional testimony explained that “[a]dulterations perilous to health are comparatively rare, but the practice of substitution, of selling something for what it is not, is going on by wholesale.”⁹⁵ And Aaron Coolidge Dowse stressed the need for state and federal regulation of food labels, noting: “The manufacture of artificial honey, of Iowa maple sugar and apple waste jelly is perfectly legitimate; the wrong consists in selling these products as something other than they are.”⁹⁶

Good Housekeeping continued to inveigh against misbranding in the oleomargarine industry. An April 1902 editorial claimed that the daily press had had a change of heart in recent years: “Influential journals, which formerly were wont to sneer at the ‘oleo’ menace are now frankly on the side of honest butter, and awake to the injustice and danger of substitution, a practice which invades nearly all branches of the traffic in

⁹⁰*Honest Food Products*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, July 1902, at 75.

⁹¹*Our International Household: A Record of Conditions and Progress*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1902, at 1 – 7, 5; *The Pure Food Bills*, 36 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Feb. 1903, at 157.

⁹²E.H. Jenkins, *Adulterated Food Products, and How to Avoid Them*, 33 Good Housekeeping, Dec. 1901, at 474 – 75, 474. E.H. Jenkins was the vice-director of the Connecticut state agricultural experiment station in charge of food inspection.

⁹³*Id.* at 475.

⁹⁴Albert H. Welles, *Truthful Labels on Food Products*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1902, at 384 – 85.

⁹⁵*Food Adulterations: Commonly Practiced in the United States, as Disclosed Before the Congressional Committee on Interstate Commerce*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 1902, at 258 – 61, 258.

⁹⁶Aaron Coolidge Dowse, *Honest Labels*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, by Oct. 1902, at 242 – 45, 243.

food products.”⁹⁷ Similarly, a July 1902 article criticized – albeit somewhat elliptically – oleomargarine manufacturers for their efforts to undo the law imposing a ten-cent per pound tax on oleomargarine colored to look like butter.⁹⁸

Despite its increased emphasis on misbranding, the magazine did not claim that the problem of dangerous foods was entirely resolved. In May 1902, an article entitled “The Baking Powder That Went to Sea: A Tale That’s True – Too True,” indignantly described the New York health department’s recent discovery that a popular brand of baking powder contained more than twenty-five percent pulverized rock, twenty-two percent sulphuric acid, and thirty-seven percent alum.⁹⁹ The author asserted: “It is to combat this very evil that we set out in this magazine months ago with our Pure Food Campaign.”¹⁰⁰ Another article commented on the ongoing problem with obtaining safe milk, especially in New York City during the summertime.¹⁰¹

But chemical preservatives were an even bigger issue. *Good Housekeeping* gave a forum to Harvey Wiley, the famous head of the Department of Agriculture’s Bureau of Chemistry and a notorious opponent of chemical food preservatives.¹⁰² In November 1901, Dr. Wiley published a lengthy article describing the harmful effects of salicylic acid.¹⁰³ He claimed that he did not seek to ban the use of salicylic acid, only mandate that its inclusion be reflected on food labels.¹⁰⁴ He went further in a January 1902 article about the use of formaldehyde in dairy products.¹⁰⁵ Given the overwhelming evidence about the dangers of formaldehyde, he claimed, such uses should be prohibited: “With criminals of this kind it is necessary to reverse the principles which control the action in a court of justice and to hold the accused guilty until he is proved innocent.”¹⁰⁶

⁹⁷ *The Fight for Pure Food*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, April 1902, at 338.

⁹⁸ *What is Oleomargarine?*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, July 1902, at 69.

⁹⁹ *The Baking Powder That Went to Sea: A Tale That’s True – Too True*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1902, at 362-63.

¹⁰⁰ *Id.* at 363.

¹⁰¹ W.G. Johnson, *Pure Milk: The Consumer Can Help Improve the Supply*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, July 1902, at 50 – 51.

¹⁰² See *infra* p. 39.

¹⁰³ H.W. Wiley, *Injurious Food Adjuncts: The Part Played by Salicylic Acid in the Preservation of Foods and its Danger*, 33 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1901, at 386 – 89.

¹⁰⁴ *Id.* at 389.

¹⁰⁵ H.W. Wiley, *Injurious Food Adjuncts: Formaldehyde or Formalin, Which Sometimes Gets Into Infants’ Food, and Often-times Into Milk and Cream*, 34 Good Housekeeping, Jan. 1902, at 22 – 25.

¹⁰⁶ *Id.* at 25.

Good Housekeeping continued to call for a national pure food law. In characteristically heated language, Ms. Kretschmar argued for collective action: “Truly individualism with us has been virtually unlicensed, and things have come to such a pass that almost everything but the air we breathe is manipulated, directed, or controlled to the end of profiting some one ground of individuals to the wronging, in most instances, of all others.”¹⁰⁷ In July 1903, Mr. Dowse described a Massachusetts case in which state officials were unable to arrest an unscrupulous butter manufacturer because he was out of state: “Isn’t that argument enough for a national pure food law, a law that will enable the officers to go back to the real fountain head of the evil and fit the punishment to the crime?”¹⁰⁸ An Iowa professor argued that differences in food quality between states justified federal intervention.¹⁰⁹ And a December 1902 editorial – in a rare burst of sympathy for food manufacturers – maintained that a national pure food law would protect manufacturers from the difficulties of navigating widely varying state laws.¹¹⁰

A notable feature of *Good Housekeeping*’s coverage of the pure food issue during these years is a sense of confidence in readers’ ability to effect meaningful change. Writers energetically urged women – who, after all, could not vote – to join the campaign for pure food legislation and enforcement. In a speech to the federated women’s clubs of Missouri, reported a January 1902 article, Ms. Kretschmar declared: “We women are not dangerous to the fundamental commercial methods of to-day, simply because, like the inmates of an insane asylum, we do not act in concert; our strength being useless excepting when directed in intelligent unity.”¹¹¹

An October 1902 editorial sounded a similar theme: “Food adulteration runs riot, largely because sufficient

¹⁰⁷Ella Morris Kretschmar, *The Higher Life: In Terms of Pure Food and Wise Household Management*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 1902, at 219 – 225, 219.

¹⁰⁸Aaron Coolidge Dowse, *On the Choice of a Grocer: A Word to Housewives as to Honest and Dishonest Dealers, and the Food Supply*, 37 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, July 1903, at 32 – 34, 33.

¹⁰⁹Wilber J. Teeters, *Recent Adulterations*, 36 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1903, at 86.

¹¹⁰*Editorial*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1902, at 474; see also *The Pure Food Campaign*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Sept. 1902, at 205 (noting that the Association of Manufacturers and Distributors of Food Products was seeking national pure food law as a solution to the problem of different state standards).

¹¹¹*Our International Household: A Record of Conditions and Progress*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1902, at 1 – 7, 6.

pressure is not brought to bear by the women of the United States upon the men who vote and make our laws.”¹¹² Contributors to *Good Housekeeping* were optimistic that women could make a difference. Octave Thanet argued: “To buy from an honorable grocers is all of our only chance, but since he may be deceived, my suffering sisters, let us try for the league and the government inspection! Time and perseverance can work wonders.”¹¹³ An April 1903 article suggested that a national pure food bill would pass the next year: “By writing their senators the women can make a profound impression and hasten the day of honest and safe food products.”¹¹⁴

Although *Good Housekeeping* vigorously campaigned for state and federal pure food legislation, it continued to emphasize that individual housekeepers also had a responsibility to take care when purchasing groceries. E.H. Jenkins recommended that housewives avoid buying items sold in bulk or by manufacturers known to put out unadulterated merchandise. Mr. Jenkins suggested getting reports from state food inspectors, and he cautioned against buying cheap foods.¹¹⁵ The question whether a housekeeper could avoid adulterated or mislabeled foods by spending more was rather controversial. Mr. Welles argued that “in all cases the cost cannot be taken as an index of quality.”¹¹⁶ However, in a parable about a housekeeper who visited a jelly factory, one author blamed adulteration on what s/he apparently saw as consumers’ reluctance to pay a fair price for pure products: “You demand low prices, and either don’t know or shut your eyes to the fact that it must be adulterated to sell at such a figure.”¹¹⁷

¹¹² *Editorial*, 35 *Good Housekeeping*, Oct. 1902, at 288.

¹¹³ *More About Brands: ‘Personally Conducted Hints on Housekeeping,’ Eighth Paper*, 33 *Good Housekeeping*, Dec. 1901, at 512 – 14, 514.

¹¹⁴ *Very Much Alive*, 36 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, Apr. 1903, at 386.

¹¹⁵ Jenkins, *supra* note 92, at 475.

¹¹⁶ Welles, *supra* note 94, at 385.

¹¹⁷ M.M., *A Canning Factory: A Housekeeper Witnesses the Manufacture of Jelly and Jam*, 35 *Good Housekeeping*, Oct. 1902, at 240 – 41, 241.

E. October 1905 – December 1907: Final push

The next turning point came in October 1905, when *Good Housekeeping* announced a new project, the Good Housekeeping Standard of Excellence for Pure Food Products.¹¹⁸ Staff scientists at the Good Housekeeping Institute would inspect various

products for purity, wholesomeness, and accuracy of labeling; including testing suspicious products by feeding them to their own families. The magazine would publish a monthly Roll of Honor for Pure Food Products.¹¹⁹

Good Housekeeping was not shy about lauding its own efforts. The editors held forth:

That we are going into this great movement heart and soul, cost what it may in courage, labor and dollars, our friends scarcely need be assured. The one word which best expresses the purpose of this magazine is *service*, the largest and truest we know how to give, and here is the grandest opportunity yet presented in the five years of the present ownership. To pass it by were a breach of our trust. The Good Housekeeping Standard of Excellence of food

products will mark a new era in the science of nutrition. The entire public, American and foreign, will be the beneficiary.¹²⁰

The magazine published dozens of letters from readers in response to this announcement. They ranged from the heartily enthusiastic – a health official from San Francisco wrote, “I appreciate the efforts of your valuable magazine in this same field of endeavor, and also esteem its efforts as an educational factor in spreading the gospel of absolute purity in food products”¹²¹ – to the condescending, such as the letter from a Providence, Rhode Island supervisor: “I am sure that you will accomplish a great deal of good, and I am also sure that

¹¹⁸*Pure Food Assurance: Definite Means Whereby Our Readers May Be Positively Assured of Healthful Food Preparations. A Practical Service of Vital Importance of Every Consumer*, 41 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 1905, at 361-64.

¹¹⁹*Id.* at 362 – 63; *Our Standard of Excellence*, 42 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Feb. 1906, at 185 – 87 (clarifying standard of excellence). The Institute’s policy mandated exclusion of all harmful preservatives, and accurate labeling for all others, including salt. *Our Standard of Excellence*, *supra*, at 186. It seems likely that this project was a precursor to *Good Housekeeping*’s current Seal of Approval system, which was instituted in 1909. See *What’s Behind the Good Housekeeping Seal*, *supra* note 86.

¹²⁰*Lend Us a Hand*, 41 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 1905, at 455 – 56.

¹²¹41 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1905, at 626.

you will find it laborious and expensive.”¹²²

Good Housekeeping continued to agitate for a national pure food law, a goal that was steadily becoming closer to reality. In January 1906, an author worried that although Congress was considering a pure food bill, it might be distracted by the more immediate concern of railway rate legislation.¹²³ In the May 1906 issue, a writer noted that the so-called Heyburn bill had passed the Senate and was likely to pass the house. The article encouraged women’s clubs and other interested parties to write to their representatives and urge them to vote for this bill: “The way to do all this is by personal letters to representatives and senators, and by formal resolutions of clubs and organizations sent direct to those officials.”¹²⁴

The quest for a national pure food bill was nearly derailed in mid-1907, when Congress appeared to have tabled the bill and prepared to complete the term without hearing it.¹²⁵ *Good Housekeeping* was clearly frustrated: “Apparently all progress that has been made by the national food movement in the past twenty years has been lost outright. The unholy coterie of fakirs who debauch and defraud the people... are in high feather. By way of response, the magazine announced that it was launching a Pure Food League to push for a national law, try to improve state laws, and otherwise campaign for pure food.”¹²⁶ But the sense of catastrophe was short-lived. Congress passed a national pure food law at the end of June 1906, and *Good Housekeeping* was officially delighted. One author described the bill’s passage as “triumphant,” and the magazine reprinted the full text of the law in its pages.¹²⁷

¹²²*Id.* at 625.

¹²³42 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1906, at 68.

¹²⁴*The Pure Food Bill*, 42 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 1906, at 527.

¹²⁵GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 246 – 47; YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 219 – 20.

¹²⁶*Id.* at 51.

¹²⁷*The Federal Pure Food Law: Its Triumphant Passage, After Our Trumpet Call of Last Month*, 43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Aug. 1906, at 225-225c.

Interestingly, even while *Good Housekeeping* was ostensibly campaigning fervently for a national pure food law, it was also publishing a host of pieces that undermined its own goal. Beginning in late 1905, the magazine offered a number of article suggestion that the problems of food adulteration and misbranding were not as serious as they used to be. A short piece in the December 1905 issue reported that during 1904, the Department of Agriculture found that only a very small percentage of food products were adulterated: “This record speaks volumes for the general purity and wholesomeness of the food supplies of eighty million people throughout a whole year.”¹²⁸ And a January 1906 article gave a glowing report of the hygiene standards in food manufacturing plant, claiming that “[m]any a food factory is cleaner than many of the kitchens or dining rooms in which its products are eaten.”¹²⁹

A couple of articles went further, suggesting that the pure food movement distracted housewives from what might be a more worthy and effective way of improving food quality – better housekeeping. A February 1906 editorial entitled “The Pure Food Craze” cautioned readers from focusing too intently on a federal pure food law:

Let us insist on righteous laws and their enforcement, but let us not use them as an excuse for shirking our own individual responsibility and personal duty in daily work and home life. To know how to prepare and serve proper food, how to eat and work so as to conserve health

and wealth, how to live in harmony with Nature’s laws – such knowledge will do more for the public than any amount of man-made statutes.¹³⁰

In the September 1906 issue, another editorial reiterated the same theme:

¹²⁸ *A Wonderful Record For Purity*, 41 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1905, at 624.

¹²⁹ *The Gospel of Cleanliness*, 42 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1906, at 68.

And some good women who ‘get all worked up over the pure food question,’ would be amazed

at the imperfections in their kitchens and upon their tables compared with the scientific knowledge, practical experience, care, and cleanliness which characterize the works of a model food factory... Activity in the campaign for pure food is commendable, but it is no excuse for inefficiency in the domestic preparation of foods.¹³¹

This dissonance in *Good Housekeeping*’s coverage of the pure food issue is puzzling. The most likely explanation is that with the introduction of its own regulation system – the Roll of Honor for Pure Food Products, published exclusively in the magazine – *Good Housekeeping* suddenly had a disincentive to press for comprehensive federal regulation. Two lengthy, flowery articles by Herbert Myrick, the president of *Good Housekeeping*, support this theory. In May 1906, Mr. Myrick reiterated the importance of good nutrition and pure food, but criticized the “negative method” of the pure food movement.¹³² Pure food activists told people what not to eat, but not what to eat. By contrast, *Good Housekeeping*’s system of certification informed consumers about products that were safe and healthful.¹³³ He expanded on this idea, although slightly more gently, in a June 1906 piece:

[T]he law and its officials, excellent in their way, are no substitute for public opinion. And if we depend upon legislatures to do that which we ought to do for ourselves, we support again the old policy of negation, whose results are as long deferred as they are negative! But let us unite through private enterprise to get what we want, to help ourselves, and in addition to all other benefits, this effort will also powerfully promote public interests and facilitate proper food laws and their enforcement.¹³⁴

A September 1906 article adds to the sense that *Good Housekeeping* viewed federal regulation as competition:

We believe that, if the public will concentrate its purchases upon such products as these, satisfactory evidence of which is afforded by our Roll of Honor, more will be done in a few months to encourage the production and consumption of proper food products than will be accomplished by all the food laws and food officials, national and state, put together.¹³⁵

¹³²Herbert Myrick, *Our Great Constructive Policy: The Positive Method of Insuring Good Food*, 42 *Good Housekeeping*, May 1906, at 524 – 27, 525.

¹³³*Id.* at 525 – 26.

¹³⁴Herbert Myrick, *Good Housekeeping’s Pure Food Assurance*, 42 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, June 1906, at 626 – 30, 628.

And finally, the August 1906 issue notes that *Good Housekeeping* had been planning to put investigators in Chicago meatpacking plants, but the new federal food and drug law had rendered the project unnecessary.¹³⁶ Despite these mixed incentives, after the passage of the Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906, *Good Housekeeping* urged its readers to familiarize themselves with its provisions and encouraged them to work to fill in the law's lacunae.¹³⁷ The magazine explained what the statute did and did not cover. A couple of writers noted that the law failed to set standards for food purity, leaving a great deal of discretion to the courts.¹³⁸ Others pointed out that the new restrictions applied only to products in interstate traffic.¹³⁹ The November 1906 issue included printed petition forms that readers could copy out and mail to their state representatives, asking them to bring state pure food laws into harmony with the new federal legislation.¹⁴⁰

From the publication of its first issue in 1885 to the passage of the first major national pure food law in 1906 (and after), *Good Housekeeping* was an energetic participant in the pure food, drink, and drug movement. Its coverage varied in emphasis and tone over the years, and its commitment to federal legislation may have waned in the last months of the campaign, but its contributions to the overall project should not be underestimated.

III. GOOD HOUSEKEEPING'S RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ACTORS IN THE PURE FOOD, DRINK, AND DRUG MOVEMENT

A. Enthusiastic Support for Women's Clubs

¹³⁶ *Insuring Good Meats*, 43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Aug. 1906, at 154.

¹³⁷ See, e.g., *Enforce the New Laws*, 43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1906, at 405.

¹³⁸ *Id.*; *Notes of Real Progress*, 43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1906, at 529 – 30.

¹³⁹ *Splendid Results of the New Law*, 43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1906, at 647; *On With the Pure Food Movement: Prepare Now to Insure Adequate Laws in Every State, and to Perfect the New National Pure Food Law*, 43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1906, at 529.

¹⁴⁰ 43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1906, at 528.

The women's club movement was one of the most important social movements in nineteenth-century America. The phenomenon arose after the Civil War, when groups of women began to form literary and culture clubs, devoted to intellectual self-improvement.¹⁴¹ During the 1880s and 1890s, however, many clubs shifted their focus to reform and civic activities.¹⁴² Scholars of women's history have extensively documented club efforts in areas such as poverty, city sanitation, and health care.¹⁴³

More recently, Lorine Swainston Goodwin has chronicled the considerable role of women's clubs in the pure food, drink, and drug movement. Women's clubs worked for pure food at the local, state, and federal levels. Groups like the New York Women's Health Protective Association successfully browbeat apathetic local officials into cleaning up filthy stockyards.¹⁴⁴ Branches of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) pressed for education about physiology and hygiene in schools.¹⁴⁵ Countless clubs agitated for state and federal pure food legislation, sending petitions to legislators and letters to the editors of local newspapers.¹⁴⁶ Their efforts were formidable; by way of example, Ms. Goodwin describes the efforts of clubwomen in one Northeastern state: "In early 1906 women's clubs in Massachusetts distributed over 500 pamphlets and held 42 pure food and drug meetings, nineteen of which were open to the public. Each of these meetings forwarded resolutions endorsing a national food and drug law to their senators and representatives in Washington."¹⁴⁷ Some of this work was coordinated by national organizations like the WCTU and General Federation of Women's Clubs,¹⁴⁸ but just as much was done by smaller, independent clubs, especially in the

¹⁴¹BLAIR, *supra* note 16, at 57 – 71.

¹⁴²*Id.* at 73, 93 – 107.

¹⁴³*See generally, e.g., id.*; SANDRA HAARSAGER, ORGANIZED WOMANHOOD: CULTURAL POLITICS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST, 1840-1920 (1997); ANASTASIA SIMS, THE POWER OF FEMININITY IN THE NEW SOUTH: WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS AND POLITICS IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1880-1930 (1997) ; JANICE C. STEINSCHNEIDER, AN IMPROVED WOMEN: THE WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, 1885-1920 (1994).

¹⁴⁴GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 17 – 23.

¹⁴⁵*Id.* at 96 – 106.

¹⁴⁶*Id.* at 185.

¹⁴⁷*Id.* at 67.

¹⁴⁸*See id.* at 88 – 130 (describing the work of the WCTU); *id.* at 131 – 51 (describing the work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Congress of Mothers' Clubs, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the Women's Educational and Industrial Union).

Southern states.¹⁴⁹

A complete – or even an adequate – account of the role of women’s clubs in securing the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906 is beyond the scope of this paper. The relevant point for this analysis is that to the extent that *Good Housekeeping* supported the club movement, it supported the campaign for pure food, drink, and drugs.

And *Good Housekeeping* did indeed support the club movement most enthusiastically. As early as December 1885, Mrs. H.M. Plunkett urged women to form clubs to discuss housekeeping techniques: “[W]e earnestly recommend the formation of Housekeeper’s Clubs – the avowed object of which is to discuss the methods and measures that go to the making of that easily appreciated, but hard-to-be-described quantity – *Good Housekeeping*.”¹⁵⁰

The magazine praised women’s clubs for their good works. A January 1899 piece noted the charitable accomplishments of many women’s clubs: “Women have just discovered the world and now want to take a hand in improving it.”¹⁵¹ The January 1901 issue ran an article – accompanied by a photograph – about the Riverside Drive Thimble Club of Binghamton, New York, which held bake sales and sewed clothes for the benefit of the local poor. The author praised the organization’s good deeds and contribution to “neighborhood sociability.”¹⁵²

Good Housekeeping also lauded the educational dimension of women’s clubs. A piece in the April 17, 1886

¹⁴⁹See *id.* at 171 – 96 (describing the work of Southern clubwomen).

¹⁵⁰H.M. Plunkett, *Housekeeper’s Clubs: How to Conduct Them – The History of a Successful One*, 1 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 12, 1885, at 82.

¹⁵¹*Notions and Novelties – IV: As Monthly Noted in the American Metropolis*, 28 Good Housekeeping, Jan. 1899, at 15 – 16, 15.

¹⁵²*A Unique Club*, 32 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1901, at 23.

issue noted that the National Women's Temperance Union offered a two-year plan of study about individual and family health. According to the article, a club in Wilmington, Delaware had already started the program "with great profit and enjoyment to the members."¹⁵³ Emma J. Gussman, writing in 1896, described her surprisingly pleasant visit to a meeting of a local women's club, where the topics of discussion included a potential settlement kitchen for the poor, the nutritional value of rice, and an informal exchange of house-keeping tips.¹⁵⁴

In addition to expanding women's knowledge base – no insignificant thing in late nineteenth century America – women's clubs also helped their members to develop organizational skills.¹⁵⁵ *Good Housekeeping* contributors noted, and praised, this phenomenon. Cora Munro suggested that clubs fostered an interest in systematic thinking and reasoning, what she called "parliamentary law."¹⁵⁶ Another article argued that "the club is an education. Women learn business methods. They grow in executive ability, self-control. order, accuracy, and above all, in a due sense of proportion."¹⁵⁷

But perhaps the most interesting aspect of *Good Housekeeping's* support of the club movement was the notion that club life fostered a modern, socialist, egalitarian perspective, gently ushering many members out of their antiquated individualistic, hierarchical modes of thinking. Ms. Munro argued that women's clubs encouraged egalitarianism by insisting on equality among members.¹⁵⁸ Another author maintained that "[a]ssociation and comradeship, in a high-minded way, teach that even the humblest may have something to give as well as to receive."¹⁵⁹ Reporting on visits to two state federations of women's clubs, the same author noted: "As for dress, of course the metropolis excels, yet there were plainly clad members who received the

¹⁵³2 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, April 17, 1886, at 358.

¹⁵⁴*Our Neighborhood Club: Neither Literary, Dramatic, nor Musical*, 22 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Apr. 1896, at 162 – 63.

¹⁵⁵BLAIR, *supra* note 16, at 69.

¹⁵⁶Cora V. Munro, *Woman and Woman's Clubs: Intelligently Considered and Successfully Defended*, 25 Good Housekeeping, July 1897, at 20 – 21, 20.

¹⁵⁷*Notions and Novelties*, *supra* note 151, at 15.

¹⁵⁸Munro, *supra* note 156, at 20.

¹⁵⁹*Notions and Novelties*, *supra* note 151, at 16.

same consideration as their wealthier sisters.”¹⁶⁰ The most eloquent proponent of this vision of club life, however, was Rebecca Lowe, the president of the General Federation of Women’s Clubs. Writing in March 1900, she maintained that “[s]ome women, and some men, too, have no talent for cooperation. Their whole personal trend is individualistic. In this they are ‘left overs’ from a past state of society, ‘survivals’ of a period when each man battled for himself alone.”¹⁶¹ Ms. Lowe suggested that many women, especially wealthy ones, were insufficiently civic-minded:

This feverish passion for ‘my child,’ ‘my husband,’ and ‘my home,’ which precluded the importance of anyone else’s child or husband or home, has narrowed their whole grasp of life and its relations. This will not do for a citizen of the world. She must have close,

vital contact with numbers of other personalities; she must learn to merge her too dominant individuality into that of a body in which she is an efficient part; she must see the beauty of co-operation and learn the lessons of breadth and tolerance and fidelity which make it possible.¹⁶²

Club work accomplishes this; a member is “by unconscious processes, being molded and modified into a more and more socialized being.”¹⁶³

There is a slightly defensive tone to a many of the *Good Housekeeping* articles about women’s clubs. One gathers that a number of men denigrated club work as frivolous and/or distracting women from their household duties. In a parable about one woman’s visit to her sister’s club, the sister comments that her husband “has a great opinion of us [the club], though he has to laugh and poke fun, and call us the ‘Hobby Club.’”¹⁶⁴ Another writer, in January 1898, urged club members to deflect criticism by becoming superlative housekeepers: “Club women ought to be the best of home makers. Every member ought to study household economics and so perfect herself in managing a household that no one will be able to say: ‘club life unfits woman for home duties.’”¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁰ *Id.*

¹⁶¹ Rebecca D. Lowe, *The Significance of the Club Movement*, 30 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, Mar. 1900, at 118 – 22, 119.

¹⁶³ *Id.*

¹⁶⁴ Susan Brown Robbins, *The Recreation Club: And the Many Things They Accomplished*, 26 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, May 1898, at 199 – 200, 200.

¹⁶⁵ *Club Women and the Home*, 26 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, Jan. 1898, at 37 (from *Our Club Outlook*).

Ms. Munro defended women's clubs against negative comments, asserting: The woman's club has done much for woman – will do more.¹⁶⁶

By heartily endorsing the women's club movement, *Good Housekeeping* furthered the pure food, drink, and drugs movement as well.

B. Disinterest in Pure Drink and Drugs

One of the strangest aspects of *Good Housekeeping's* participation in the campaign for pure food, drink, and drugs is that its efforts were almost completely confined to the issue of pure food. In between 1885 and 1907, the magazine only rarely addressed the problem of drug purity, and it never even mentioned alcoholic beverages. Given that both of these issues were absolutely central to the broader movement that culminated in the Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906, this omission is startling.

Drug purity – especially as it related to patent medicines – was an especially crucial part of the campaign for a federal law.¹⁶⁷ At the turn of the century, patent, or proprietary, medicines were a hundred-million-dollar business. Innumerable tonics and syrups, many of them intended for use with children, contained dangerous and addictive amounts of opium, morphine, and cocaine. Others were little more than enormous doses of alcohol. Adulteration and mislabeling were virtually universal. Patent medicine manufacturers made all sorts of fraudulent claims about their products, and many of them had notorious “red clauses” in their advertising contracts with newspapers – these clauses invalidated the contract if the state in which the newspaper published enacted any law restricting the manufacture or sale of proprietaries.¹⁶⁸ Such practices

¹⁶⁶Munro, *supra* note 156, at 20.

¹⁶⁷Indeed, the 1906 Act itself included standards for drug adulteration, arguably making the law more stringent for drugs than it was for foods. See Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906, 34 Stat. 768, at § 7.

¹⁶⁸GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 45 – 47.

were key targets for the pure food, drink, and drug activists.

During its first few years, *Good Housekeeping* did publish a few articles warning readers of the dangers of patent medicines. In 1886, Ella Guernsey warned housewives about the dangers of drug dependency:

Do, please pause before becoming enslaved to the ‘quinine’ or ‘morphine’ habit. A delicate, refined wife and mother was ordered by her medical attendant to take small capsules filled with quinine. The doses were increased in size and taken oftener, until sixty capsules had been swallowed, and then she could not do without it. Years have slipped by and to-day thin and frail, with shaking hands, she daily measures out a teaspoon filled with quinine, declaring ‘she is fit for nothing until she takes her tonic.’¹⁶⁹

Similarly, a February 1891 article, written by “A Mother at Home,” cautioned against overusing patent medicines:

[A] drug store filled with ‘patent medicines’ is too often a source of danger and damage to the community in which it exists. Not that all patent medicines are in themselves harmful; many of them, it must be admitted, are valuable under the conditions for which they are

prepared and intended. But the trouble is that they are too handy for immediate use, and the practice of dosing grows with the means for easy indulgence, whether a medicine is or is not required.¹⁷⁰

A column in the March 1891 issue went further, declaring: “Without exaggeration, I should say that nine out of ten of these proprietary medicines are frauds, pure and simple; the real business is advertising for dupes. The medical part of it is but a side issue.”¹⁷¹

But compared to the dozens of articles that *Good Housekeeping* published on the subject of pure food, its coverage of patent medicines was minimal. Indeed, the magazine’s approach stands in sharp contrast to that of magazine like *The Ladies Home Journal* and *Collier’s*, both of which established firm anti-patent medicine positions.¹⁷² From October 1905 to February 1906, for example, *Collier’s* published a renowned series of

¹⁶⁹Ella Guernsey, *Poisons. Some Don’ts and Do’s*, 3 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Sept. 4, 1886, at 215.

¹⁷¹*The Family Medicine Chest*, 12 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 1891, at 143.

¹⁷²YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 197 – 203.

articles by Samuel Hopkins Adams exposing the corrupt business practices of the proprietaries industry.¹⁷³

What's more, *Good Housekeeping* apparently devoted no attention whatsoever to the problem of pure drink, which was an equally live issue.¹⁷⁴ This latter omission is especially notable given the intense involvement of the WCTU in the pure food movement.¹⁷⁵ Of course, the WCTU's ultimate goal was temperance, rather than simply making alcoholic beverages purer, but at least during the late nineteenth century, the organization "believed that adulterated food, drink, and drugs were both causative agents and an integral part of an expanded definition of intemperance."¹⁷⁶ Furthermore, plenty of patent medicines were functionally equivalent to a stiff drink.

Why did *Good Housekeeping* focus on pure food to the exclusion of pure drink and drugs? It seems unlikely that the magazine's editors simply thought the problems of patent medicines and adulterated alcohol unimportant or irrelevant, given those issues' prominence in the greater pure food movement. More importantly, it does not seem like *Good Housekeeping* was at all dependent on advertising revenues from patent medicine or liquor interests, at least not after its first few years. The magazine's first issues do contain a number of advertisements for medical and cosmetic products that – if not technically patent medicines – were still rather dubious.¹⁷⁷ Some of these products, ironically enough, were advertised as curing opium, alcohol, or morphine habits. After these early years, though, *Good Housekeeping* stopped these advertisements, and it had never published ads for alcohol.

¹⁷³*Id.* at 199 – 203.

¹⁷⁴See GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 44 – 45.

¹⁷⁵See *supra* pp. 30 – 32.

¹⁷⁶GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 89. Ms. Goodwin explains that at the turn of the century, after the death of its renowned leader, Frances Willard, the WCTU refocused its efforts towards temperance more narrowly. *Id.* at 110.

¹⁷⁷See, e.g., 4 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, July 9, 1887, at xii (advertising "Dr. Campbell's Safe Arsenic Complexion Wafers").

The most likely explanation, then, is that for some reason, *Good Housekeeping* wanted to distance itself from the temperance issue. The fights against patent medicines and impure alcohol were far more tied to the temperance movement than was the battle for pure food. Evidence for this theory includes not only the relative lack of articles about adulterated drugs and drink, but also the magazine's overall focus on non-temperance women's groups, such as the Federation clubs. And notably, *Good Housekeeping* barely discussed the temperance movement itself.

It is unclear why *Good Housekeeping* might have wanted to avoid appearing to side with the temperance reformers. It might simply have been that the magazine's leadership was unsympathetic to the anti-alcohol cause. More provocatively, perhaps the editors felt that their readership was not in favor of temperance. Indeed, although the pure food movement benefited in many ways from the energy and organizational abilities of the WCTU, the association with temperance might have harmed the pure food cause's credibility among some sectors – especially men.

Regardless of the underlying reasons for the phenomenon, *Good Housekeeping*'s exclusion of the issues of pure drugs and drink demonstrates that women's participation in the pure food, drink, and drug movement was anything but monolithic. This is a point that unfortunately often gets lost in discussions of the movement leading up to the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906.¹⁷⁸ Housewives like the ones targeted by *Good Housekeeping* were crucial to these efforts, but they participated for very different reasons, and often, in different ways.

C. Cooperation and Conflict with Harvey Wiley

¹⁷⁸Indeed, this author would suggest that questions of internal disagreement and dissension are too often neglected in studies of women's history more generally.

One of the most prominent figures in the pure food, drink and drugs movement was Harvey Wiley, head chemist of the Bureau of Chemistry at the United States Department of Agriculture. As the face of the campaign for national pure food legislation, Dr. Wiley was a magnet for controversy, not only during his life, but after his death, since which historians have battled about his legacy. Part IV will explore the question of how to apportion credit for the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906 among the various actors, including Dr. Wiley. This Part examines the contours of the longstanding relationship between Dr. Wiley and *Good Housekeeping*.

Harvey Wiley was born in 1844, in southern Indiana.¹⁷⁹ After a childhood on a farm, he attended Hanover College and then Indiana Medical College, from which he received an M.D. degree in 1871.¹⁸⁰ He later obtained a B.D. in chemistry at Harvard.¹⁸¹ From 1874 to 1883, Dr. Wiley taught chemistry at the newly opened Purdue University; during this same time, he also became state chemist of Indiana and published his first article, on the adulteration of glucose.¹⁸² In 1883, Dr. Wiley was appointed chief chemist at the Department of Agriculture, where he spent the next twenty-nine years and made himself into a household name.¹⁸³

Beginning in late 1901, Dr. Wiley appeared occasionally in *Good Housekeeping's* pages. The doctor was well-known for his distrust of chemical preservatives – in 1902, he conducted the notorious “Poison Squad” experiments, in which he fed twelve young male volunteers quantities of chemical preservatives.¹⁸⁴ Dr. Wiley wrote two articles for *Good Housekeeping* on the subject, one on salicylic acid and one about formaldehyde.¹⁸⁵ The December 1906 issue printed his photograph, along with the other members of the newly formed federal Pure Food Commission.¹⁸⁶

¹⁷⁹YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 100.

¹⁸⁰*Id.* at 101.

¹⁸¹*Id.*

¹⁸²*Id.* at 101 – 02.

¹⁸³*Id.* at 102.

¹⁸⁴See YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 151 – 57.

¹⁸⁵See *supra* p. 22.

¹⁸⁶43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1906, at 667.

The relationship between Dr. Wiley and *Good Housekeeping* had its tensions, however. One factor was that the magazine's pure food certification program, as noted earlier, arguably detracted from its enthusiasm for a national pure food law.¹⁸⁷ When *Good Housekeeping* announced its new program, Dr. Wiley wrote a letter to the editor expressing somewhat lukewarm enthusiasm:

The task which you have undertaken is considered to be one of extreme difficulty, and it will require great tact and great scientific knowledge to carry it out. The consumers

of our country ought certainly to have some guarantee of the character of the foods they purchase. If the United States and the various states refuse or are unable to give this guarantee, it of course remains for private enterprise to undertake the work.¹⁸⁸

And Mr. Myrick surely had Dr. Wiley's efforts in mind when he criticized the "negative method" of the pure food movement, which supposedly told people what not to eat, but not what to eat.¹⁸⁹

What's more, although Dr. Wiley worked extensively and productively with women's clubs throughout the pure food campaign, there were occasional signs of strain. Professor Young has noted: "The bachelor chief chemist could be patronizing about woman's role. 'I fully realize,' he wrote for publication, 'the peculiar function of woman in social life. I know she is not intended by nature, by taste, nor by education, as a rule, to follow the pursuits which are reserved for men.'" ¹⁹⁰ Ms. Goodwin argues that Dr. Wiley "tried to channel the activities of women's organizations into a mode he visualized for them."¹⁹¹ Little of this tension was reflected in the pages of *Good Housekeeping*, although a December 1907 editorial offered a sharp response to Dr. Wiley's comment in an interview that American cooking needed improvement: "Don't blame the cooks too much, Professor Wiley; let us teach our menfolk to forget money-making long enough to appreciate their victuals, and partake with pleasure and profit. This will hasten the day of better cooking."¹⁹²

Nevertheless, after Dr. Wiley resigned from the Department of Agriculture in 1912 – under strained cir-

¹⁸⁷ See *supra* pp. 28 – 29.

¹⁸⁹ Myrick, *supra* note 132, at 525.

¹⁹⁰ YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 184.

¹⁹¹ GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 223.

¹⁹² *Another Movement*, 45 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1907, at 688 – 89, 689.

cumstances – he joined the staff of *Good Housekeeping* and administered the new Seal of Approval. His biographer notes that although *Good Housekeeping* offered Dr. Wiley \$10,000 a year, “it was not money primarily that moved him,” but rather the opportunity to “to propagandize for his immediate pure-food objectives but also to spread the gospel of health through proper nourishment, a life-long interest to which he had recently given increasing attention.”¹⁹³ He continued to work there until 1927, three years before his death.¹⁹⁴

IV. Themes in the Campaign for Pure Food

A. Moralism

Reformers in the pure food, drink, and drugs movement frequently cast their arguments in moral terms. Commentator James Harvey Young explains: “The crusade for food and drug control shared with overall Progressivism a deep worry about ‘purity’: business, government at all levels, social conduct, even the bloodlines of the nation’s populace seemed threatened with pollution and required cleaning up.”¹⁹⁵ *Good Housekeeping*’s coverage of the pure food issue exemplified this trend.

Contributors to *Good Housekeeping* linked physical health to moral health. In a regular column during the magazine’s early years, entitled “The Philosophy of Eating,” Marian Deveraux argued: “The hygienic and moral reforms which women have so much at heart, must have one of their starting points in the cuisine.”¹⁹⁶

¹⁹³OSCAR E. ANDERSON, JR., THE HEALTH OF A NATION: HARVEY W. WILEY AND THE FIGHT FOR PURE FOOD 249 (1958); see also *id.* at 259 – 61 (describing Dr. Wiley’s work at the magazine).

¹⁹⁴*Id.* at 276, 278.

¹⁹⁵YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 293; see also GOODWIN 72 – 77 (describing the powerfully moralistic and emotional rhetoric that the reformers employed).

¹⁹⁶Marian S. Devereux, *The Philosophy of Eating*, 1 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, May 2, 1885, at 12.

She urged readers to “[r]egard the body as a temple of which the high priest nature, continually says keep it pure, strong, and well for the service for which it was made.”¹⁹⁷ Nutritious food was a prerequisite for good citizenship and upright behavior; conversely, poor nutrition led to immorality and crime. Harry Douglas, editor of the *Berkshire News*, wrote in a letter to *Good Housekeeping*: “Take care of the digestive organs and the heart and brain and soul of humanity will as a rule take care of themselves. Improper nourishment, indigestion, and an illy [sic] sustained body are factors in crime, while content and prosperity are promoted by a healthy diet.”¹⁹⁸ A particularly heated article in the June 1906 issue declared: “If all parents bred and reared their children properly, the world would be regenerated in a single generation! It is a problem of nutrition, of children, of the home!”¹⁹⁹

On this theory, the pure food movement was a moral quest to make America a healthier, safer, better place. One author explained: National virility likewise depends on individual health to such an extent, and this in turn is so largely governed by our food, that the healthfulness of foods is a matter of the most serious consequence to the nation.²⁰⁰ Perhaps the most comprehensive statement of this perspective was a May 1906 article by Mr. Myrick, the magazine’s president:

But I do declare that perversion of the sexual instinct, the temptation to commit ethical

wrong, and the tendency to so-called crime, are each and all largely the inevitable result of malnutrition, due to improperly eating improper nourishment. This is not a treatise upon shiftlessness, poverty, sickness, thriftlessness or other economic ills that produce the ‘dependent classes.’ But, when traced back to their source, each and all of these evils are found to be largely the product of under-nutrition or some other abuse of the digestive organism.... *Good Housekeeping*’s Pure Food Assurance is based upon the profound conviction that, while each one of us desires to be well nourished and strong physically, mentally, spiritually, and amply provided for our material welfare, yet the instinct of self-preservation, the love of gain, are divinely coupled with the instinct of altruism – the desire to be of service to our fellows, the longing for the largesse of life here and hereafter that comes to the elect who know how to live.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁹⁸ Harry Douglas, 19 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, Sept. 1894, at 132 (letter to the editor).

¹⁹⁹ *Age of Honesty to Follow Era of Graft*, 42 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, June 1906, at 630.

²⁰⁰ *Pure Food Assurance: Definite Means Whereby Our Readers May Be Positively Assured of Healthful Food Preparations*, 41 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, Oct. 1905, at 361 – 64, 361,

In addition to endangering Americans' health – by adulteration with harmful ingredients or by misrepresenting nutritional content – purveyors of adulterated or mislabeled food cheated consumers. This, too, was a moral outrage. In June 1902, August Gans sharply criticized the mislabeling of butter and coffee: “I merely speak about the commercialism which the American people have adopted as a perfect matter of course, an everyday swindle, for the purpose of ‘grafting’ some more money besides the ordinary profits.”²⁰² A November 1905 piece praising the magazine’s certification plan suggested that the only opposition came from deceitful manufacturers who had profited by substituting inferior products for supposedly better ones: Such people recognize that *Good Housekeeping’s* Pure Food Assurance may yet prove the death of the insidious, shrewd, unobtrusive but none the less vicious system of substitution upon which they have traded for years.²⁰³

A subtheme in the moralistic rhetoric of the pure food, drink and drug reformers was a not-so-subtle critique of capitalism, or at least late-nineteenth century American laissez-faire capitalism. They assailed the profit motive, arguing that immoral manufacturers would stop at nothing in their insatiable drive for the almighty dollar. Mr. Dowse urged housewives to seek out honest grocers: “It is for you to determine whether the true and honorable merchants shall reap reward for faithfulness to high and noble ideas, or shall be swallowed up in the whirlpool of a conscienceless competition that magnifies the dollar and cheapens the product.”²⁰⁴

Similarly, Ms. Kretschmar wrote in April 1901:

[S]o insidiously corroding to the very core of the conscience is the spirit of commercial ‘enterprise’ ruling the business world to-day that the guilty are often not even aware of their crimes, certainly not of their far-reaching effects, which, let use believe, are not inquired into. There is, we are all aware, a common business goal – money; and almost any avenue to it is legitimate in a ‘commercial sense.’²⁰⁵

²⁰²August E. Gans, *Bogus Butter and Coffee*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, June 1902, at 474.

²⁰³*Pure Good Assurance: A Positive Guide to the Choice of Healthful Food Preparations*, 41 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Nov. 1905, at 531 – 34, 534.

²⁰⁴Dowse, *supra* note 108, at 34.

Opponents to pure food, drink, and drug legislation argued that it was the government had no business interfering in private commerce.²⁰⁶ Pure food advocates like the ones who contributed to *Good Housekeeping* offered an alternative moral vision.

As noted in Part I, *Good Housekeeping* itself was dedicated to the proposition that careful, thorough housekeeping was itself a morally virtuous practice. The notion of the pure food, drink, and drugs movement as a moral crusade fit neatly within this perspective. Unscrupulous manufacturers made it impossible for the dedicated housewife to fulfill her obligations to her family and to society. The quest to stop adulteration and misbranding, then, was nothing short of a “holy war.”²⁰⁷

B. Faith in Science

Ms. Goodwin has noted that pure food, drink, and drug reformers blamed a host of recent developments for what they perceived as a dramatic deterioration of the nation’s food, drink and drug supply.²⁰⁸ Industrialization, the construction of a transportation system that facilitated a national market, and the development of chemicals for preserving food and concealing rot, all contributed to the declining quality of American food.²⁰⁹ The famous game creator Milton Bradley – who was on *Good Housekeeping*’s original editorial

²⁰⁶ See, e.g., *Hearing Before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives on the Pure-Food Bills H.R. 5077 and 6295 for Preventing the Adulteration, Misbranding, and Imitation of Foods, Beverages, Candies, Drugs, and Condiments in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for Regulating Interstate Traffic Therein, and For Other Purposes*, 57th Cong. 10 (1904) (statement of Rep. Mann) (“We want to know whether you are going to destroy the meat-packing industry of the country tomorrow in its foreign business, worth millions of dollars a year, which you can destroy tomorrow by your ipse dixit if this bill becomes a law?”).

²⁰⁷ Plunkett, *supra* note 61, at 243.

²⁰⁸ GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 47.

²⁰⁹ *Id.* at 47 – 50.

board – wrote in October 1894:

In these days of scientific progress and commercial cupidity the multiplicity of things new

or old bearing most wonderful and bewildering names, which are being offered to us by our butcher, our baker and groceryman, renders it quite impossible for the family provider to correctly determine which are most desirable when considered from the economic and the epicurean standpoint, or which are merely harmless.²¹⁰

Yet, the pure food, drink and drug movement generally, and *Good Housekeeping* in particular, were overwhelmingly enthusiastic about “progress,” especially when it came to science. One letter to *Good Housekeeping* in October 1905 declared: “It will not do to tell the people to go back to the old days, when every family on the farm could raise and prepare its own foods. We can’t do that any more than we can return to the spinning wheel or the hand card.”²¹¹ An 1886 editorial suggested that although “the progress of civilization is rendering necessary an endless variety of precautions for the preservation of health and life,” improved knowledge about health risks was a step forward: “Every effort that reveals a lurking danger to life or health is an investment for all time, promising unceasing return in happiness.”²¹²

Indeed, *Good Housekeeping* was emphatically committed to the idea of scientific housekeeping.²¹³ In 1899, Mrs. Burton Smith urged housekeepers to set aside tradition and follow the dictates of science instead, noting wistfully that “[s]ome day we may have our food served to us economically, in proper proportion and in dainty form, by scientific corporations, but until that time, the housekeeper must wrestle with the problem in her own home.”²¹⁴ Similarly, Harriet Towner insisted that “a household should be governed by

²¹¹ *Pure Food Assurance*, *supra* note 118, at 362.

²¹² *Life a Constant Precaution*, 3 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, Sept. 18, 1886, at 250.

²¹³ One historian has suggested that this commitment was characteristic of late-nineteenth century club women: “[A] new generation of clubwomen returned to the idea of a woman’s sphere but rejected sentimentality in favor of the scientific and historical vision of the Gilded Age. They stressed how scientific motherhood, if translated into efficient, nonpartisan, and tough-minded public action, could bring social progress.” Paula Baker, *The Domestication of Politics: Women and American Political Society, 1780 – 1920*, 89 *AM. HIST. REV.* 620, 632 (June 1984).

²¹⁴ (Mrs.) Burton Smith, *Home Science – IV: Foods*, 29 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, Oct. 1899, at 178 – 84, 179.

reason and scientific truth, and not by tradition and appetite.”²¹⁵

Perhaps the most notable manifestation of this dedication to science was *Good Housekeeping*’s enthusiastic advocacy of home economics – or “domestic science” education, in both women’s clubs and universities. Ms. Towner attributed the new interest in scientific housekeeping to “the college girl,” who “early disappointed her critics by turning her knowledge and mental training to use in the home.”²¹⁶ In a January 1901 piece, the renowned cooking teacher Emma Ewing described the development of cooking schools and university home economics departments.²¹⁷ She praised domestic science classes as a “legitimate and essential part of a young woman’s education.”²¹⁸

During 1902, *Good Housekeeping* published a series of articles about domestic science education in colleges. A January 1902 article reporting on interviews with the presidents of Smith, Radcliffe, Mount Holyoke, Vassar, and Wellesley revealed that the issue was a controversial one; the goal of giving women a broader education was sometimes in tension with the idea that women should study the things they needed to know to run a household “scientifically.”²¹⁹ In the March 1902 issue, several professors of home economics argued on behalf of their field. Alice Peloubet Norton, of the University of Chicago, maintained that colleges and universities “should recognize the dignity of everyday problems.”²²⁰ Katharine Coman of Wellesley urged women’s colleges to offer electives in domestic science.”²²¹ And an editorial argued that the benefits of home economics classes accrued to women and men alike: “[D]omestic or sanitary science is as fundamental, as profitable for training and culture, as any of the sciences taught to men and women

²¹⁵Harriet C. Towner, *Women’s Clubs and Household Economics: A Broad Plane of Usefulness and a High Standard*, 228 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, April 1899, at 156 – 58, 156,

²¹⁶*Id.* at 156; cf. *infra* IV.B (discussing *Good Housekeeping*’s attitude towards women more generally).

²¹⁷Emma P. Ewing, *The Evolution of Household Economics*, 32 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1901, at 12 – 15.

²¹⁸*Id.* at 15.

²¹⁹*Our International Household: A Record of Conditions and Progress*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1902, at 1 – 7. The March 1903 issue listed sixty-nine different institutions that offered courses in cooking and/or domestic science. The list included a disproportionate number of agricultural schools and institutions devoted to African-American education. 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 1902, at 260 – 61

²²⁰Alice Peloubet Norton, *Training for the Home*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 1902, at 212 – 13, 212.

²²¹Katharine Coman, *The Educational Value of Domestic Science*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 1902, at 213.

alike.”²²²

The pure food, drink, and drug movement meshed well with this confidence in the benefits of science for the ordinary home, in several ways. For one thing, perhaps because of the relatively recent innovation of germ theory,²²³ there was a powerful sense that the modern, scientific home would be much cleaner than its predecessors. One author commented that “a very close relation exists between sanitary conditions and social progress.”²²⁴ The “purity” campaign was, among other things, an effort to make American kitchens more hygienic. Second, the scientific housekeeper was supposed to feed her family in accordance with the most recent knowledge about human nutrition – indeed, *Good Housekeeping* often published lists of the vitamin and nutrient contents of various foods. Adulterated and mislabeled foods hampered her efforts. Finally, greater faith in science arguably translated into increased confidence in the ability of government experts – “with their polariscopes and microscopes”²²⁵ – to control the quality of the food, drink, and drug supply.

C. The Special Role of Women

In an 1884 speech to delegates from the Michigan WCTU chapters, pure food, drink, and drug reformer Ella Kellogg declared “The home is woman’s citadel; it is here disease most often threatens, and who shall meet the foe if not she?”²²⁶ Pure food was an ideal issue for late-nineteenth century clubwomen activists, for it directly concerned women’s traditional sphere, the home. Late-nineteenth century women were acutely aware that food and medicine adulteration undermined their ability to care properly for their families.²²⁷

²²² *For a Broader Home Life*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 1902, at 262.

²²³ See Francis P. Whittlesey, *The Germ Theory: Some Important Points for Domestic Application*, 6 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Feb. 4, 1888, at 163 – 64 (explaining germ theory).

²²⁴ *Sanitary Science at the University of Chicago*, 34 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Mar. 1902, at 214 – 15, 214.

²²⁵ Plunkett, *supra* note 61, at 243.

²²⁶ GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 29 (quoting Kellogg).

²²⁷ See *id.* at 60.

Yet in order to achieve the changes necessary to fulfill their traditional roles, women had to step outside the home, into the historically male realms of science, politics, and law. The nature and language of the pure food movement reflects this tension. Women reformers emphasized that pure food was a woman's issue and that women, who were supposedly removed from the corrupting forces of money and politics, were especially well-suited to effect needed reforms.

Historians disagree as to whether pure food reformers employed the rhetoric of domesticity merely in service of their specific goals, or also as a vehicle for greater political influence more generally. Professor Blair suggests that clubwomen of that era pursued what she calls "Domestic Feminism": "Despite public criticism, thousands of nineteenth century women effectively employed the lady's traits to justify their departure from the home to exert special influence on the male sphere. By invoking their supposed natural talents, women took the ideology of the home with them, ending their confinement and winning influence in the public realm."²²⁸ In contrast, Ms. Goodwin rejects the notion that women pure food advocates sought to assert gender equality: "At that time, most reformers did not conduct their activities in a gender-conflict context, resented accusations that they were trying to step out of their traditional roles as wives and mothers, and opposed the vote for women until well into the twentieth century."²²⁹

Good Housekeeping's coverage of the pure food issue clearly reflects the notion that women, by both nature and role, had a special commitment to the pure food, drink, and drugs movement. Yet a close reading does little to resolve the historical controversy about the connection between the pure food movement and other campaigns for women's rights.

Contributors to *Good Housekeeping* stressed that women, as guardians of the home, had a special obligation

²²⁸BLAIR, *supra* note 16, at 4.

²²⁹GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 38 – 39.

to work for pure food, both inside and outside the home. Mrs. Smith declared: “Whether in the home or out of it, the problems of body nutrition demand the attention of women. They are by nature givers of nutrition. ‘Lady’ means ‘loaf-giver.’”²³⁰ Similarly, Ms. Kretschmar argued that women had a central role in the quest for pure food legislation:

If every woman in the land could be made to realize that what is doing in Washington and in our state legislatures (in the matter of pure food agitation and legislation) has an actual, definite, and incalculable bearing upon her darling baby’s smile, her boy’s sturdiness,

her daughter’s beauty and grace, the happiness of them all, she would sit up nights to study that question in all its ins and outs, and give by day her fine and faithful energies to its practical elucidation.²³¹

And an August 1900 piece declared that women are “natural sanitarians”: “Women, by office and evolution, are the housekeepers and health-officers of the family. Let them become publicly and officially our health-officers and sanitary managers.”²³²

Writers also suggested that women brought a higher moral authority to the pure food issue. As discussed previously, pure food advocates decried the greed of unscrupulous manufacturers, and many suggested that such avarice was the natural outgrowth of unchecked capitalist impulses. The subtext to this discussion was that women, who (ostensibly, at least) participated in the commercial world only as consumers, were above such crassness. They were also supposedly above the mud and corruption of the political world, being nonvoters.²³³ A particularly notable article in the January 1907 issue, which discussed the effect that women’s activism had had on the previous Congress, illustrates this perspective:

Heretofore the right to petition and resolve, with a few notable exceptions, has been usurped or tacitly granted to men with their influence as voters, and unfortunately their motives have not always been above question. The women, however, may be counted on now to represent the sweeter – the unselfish cause. They have proved that their influence

²³⁰Smith, *supra* note 214, at 184.

²³²*Born Sanitarians*, 31 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Aug. 1900, at 98 (from *Philadelphia Medical Journal*).

²³³See GOODWIN, *supra* note 9, at 56 – 57.

will not only be popular but righteous.²³⁴

From one angle, the evidence from *Good Housekeeping* supports Ms. Goodwin's theory that the pure food movement sought only to extrapolate women's sphere further into society, not transcend it entirely. For one thing, *Good Housekeeping's* contributors were not especially sympathetic to the notion of "women's rights." The magazine rarely discussed women's suffrage, and when it did, its coverage was largely negative. A July 1897 piece quoted a letter from a reader who clearly had no use for equality:

I shrink from the idea of independence and cold, proud, isolation with my emancipated sister-women, who struggle into their own coats unassisted, and get red in the face putting

on their own skates, and hang on to a strap in the street car in the proud consciousness that they are independent and the equal of men....Let them give us a vote if they will. I shall want at least three men to go with me to the polls – one to hold my purse, one to hold my gloves, and the third to show me how to cast my vote.²³⁵

Along similar lines, in the December 1904 issue, Rubie Weyburn published a poem entitled "Woman's Rights": "A woman's right to charm, to please. To light with love and cheer.... A woman's right to suffer. In silence with a smile...."²³⁶

And *Good Housekeeping's* contributing writers emphasized that women's participation in the pure food, drink, and drugs campaign was an extension of women's domestic roles. An October 1902 editorial decrying food adulteration, as well as increased food and coal prices, declared that "[o]ne need not be a woman suffragist to recognize the imperative demand just now for an overpowering feminine sentiment for the protection of the home from these several impositions and dangers."²³⁷ A July 1907 editorial responding to criticism from the renowned author Charlotte Perkins Gilman is especially illuminating. Apparently Ms.

²³⁴L.D. Gibbs, *Woman's Capture of Congress*, 44 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Jan. 1907, at 36 – 38, 37.

²³⁶Rubie T. Weyburn, *Woman's Rights*, 39 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Dec. 1904, at 684.

²³⁷*A Present Duty*, 35 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 1902, at 288.

Gilman had written a letter to *Good Housekeeping* suggesting that the magazine publish articles on topics broader than housekeeping. *Good Housekeeping's* response is a classic example of the conservative vision of turn-of-the-century women's activism:

But the duties of wifehood and motherhood as we see them are a of a range and character so wide and exalted, so far beyond the familiar conceptions, that before the mother expends

her surplus energies in doctoring or pleading at the bar, we want to see what she can do to rear healthy, well-balanced children, exercising in this great work [her] talents and special knowledge ... we want to see what she can accomplish, in her maternal capacity, to better the milk supply, and the water supply, to improve domestic architecture, tone up public school education, and raise the civic standard of our entire nation.²³⁸

In other ways, though, *Good Housekeeping* emphatically rejected traditional ideas about women's roles. In its early years, the magazine ran countless articles urging husbands to give their wives regular household allowances – as befitting women's status as equal partners – rather than requiring them to ask for money for each expenditure. And *Good Housekeeping* was certainly not opposed to women working outside the home; beginning with the November 9, 1889 issue, Mrs. Helen Campbell wrote a regular column entitled “Women's Work and Wages,” recounting various women's accomplishments at work, at school, and in clubs. Indeed, as noted earlier, *Good Housekeeping* was an enthusiastic proponent both of women's clubs and of higher education for women.²³⁹ A June 1905 editorial announced that the women of today “demand that the training of girls be first with a view to an endowment of physical health and common sense, and secondly to a breadth of thought and capacity for action that shall qualify them to attain the best development their environment may afford.”²⁴⁰

Furthermore, although the magazine largely portrayed the pure food movement as the natural outgrowth of women's domestic interests and talents, it sometimes hinted at a broader agenda. In her article about

²³⁹ See *supra* III.A. – B.

²⁴⁰ 40 *GOOD HOUSEKEEPING*, June 1905, at 700.

women's clubs, Ms. Lowe implicitly rejected the notion of separate spheres: "The fact of the business is, that women is in her sphere, but the sphere itself has changed and is changing before our eyes. It is no longer 'home' in the sense of four walls and the few persons who are held to her by ties of blood. 'Home' means the world and all the people in it."²⁴¹ Discussing *Good Housekeeping's* readers' interest in the pure food campaign, Mr. Myrick noted that the modern women "'means business' in her desire to promote her private interests and the public welfare by co-operating through organization."²⁴² And in the aforementioned article about women's political accomplishments, L.D. Gibbs suggested:

Women's clubs, the longtime subject for jest, ridicule, or smiling tolerance, have moved up into a new place. They are not yet comfortable in the strange surroundings; the prominence and responsibility are somewhat disconcerting save to the more hardy. But to have influence

is a pleasing sensation to women as well as men and the new sphere of activity will be held and widened.²⁴³

Finally, *Good Housekeeping* assumed that women were both intelligent and competent. A modern reader is struck by the scientific and legal detail in the magazine's analysis of the pure food issue. Ms. Kretschmar commented that when she consulted Senator Mason about his efforts for national pure food legislation, "he expressed himself as graciously ready for any discussion, but doubtful as to the probability of the feminine mind being open to the legal aspects of a question."²⁴⁴ Apparently she persisted, because much of the rest of the article was devoted to a comprehensive analysis of precisely such legalities. In fact, *Good Housekeeping* of 1902 was arguably a more sophisticated magazine than is *Good Housekeeping* of 2002. By way of illustration, the September 1907 issue tells readers how to obtain a book from the Patent Law association of Washington,

The Foods and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906: A study, with Text of the Act, Annotated, the Rules and Regulations

²⁴¹Lowe, *supra* note 161, at 119.

²⁴²Herbert Myrick, *Good Housekeeping's Pure Food Assurance*, 42 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, June 1906, at 626 – 30, 629.

²⁴⁴Kretschmar, *supra* note 107, at 220.

for the Enforcement of the Act, *Food Inspection Decisions and Official Food Standards*.²⁴⁵ It is hard to imagine today's magazine noting, as did the 1907 editors, that "the general public should welcome this useful book."²⁴⁶

V. The Question of Credit

The Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906 has inspired a substantial body of historical scholarship. One of the central questions in this historiography is the question of who can claim primary credit for the Act's passage.²⁴⁷ Although a full treatment of this question is beyond the scope of this paper, *Good Housekeeping's* coverage of the pure food, drink, and drugs issue offers some support to the theory that women – and women's clubs in particular – deserve more credit for this social movement than they are usually afforded.

Historians disagree about the nature and significance of women's participation in the pure food campaign.

Professor Young sees women as supporters, rather than leaders:

Throughout the nineteenth century, indeed, women had organized to seek through political pressure remedies for injustices they observed in the social order. Their efforts had been mainly

local and aimed at abuses within the domestic sphere. By the early twentieth century, however, government had begun to assume some of the responsibilities that had traditionally been considered the domain of women's voluntary endeavor. Women recognized and supported this change. The food and drug campaign formed a central element in this trend, the 'domestication of politics,' the shifting of major policy obligations from the private to the public sector.²⁴⁸

Professor Young dates women's involvement in the pure food campaign to the early 1900s, and he largely credits Dr. Wiley with bringing organized women's groups – especially the General Federation of Women's

²⁴⁵45 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Sept. 1907, at 321.

²⁴⁶See *id.*

²⁴⁷See YOUNG, *supra* note 1, at 221 – 25 (surveying the various histories of the Federal Food and Drug Act and the simultaneous Meat Inspection Amendment).

Clubs – into the movement.²⁴⁹

Unsurprisingly, Harvey Wiley’s biographer, Oscar Anderson, also sees Dr. Wiley as spearheading the pure food campaign: “

In the long struggle for legislation the central figure had been Harvey Wiley... Federal food

and drug legislation, of course, would have been enacted eventually even if Wiley had never left Purdue. But the campaign needed leadership. By profession, position, and temperament, Wiley was able to supply it.... Wiley was in large part responsible for the fact that food and drug legislation came when it did and in the form that it did.²⁵⁰

Like Professor Young, Professor Anderson describes women as becoming engaged late in the movement, during the early 1900s, and he gives Dr. Wiley substantial credit for mobilizing women’s groups.²⁵¹

In contrast, Ms. Goodwin emphatically lays credit for much of the pure food movement’s success at the feet of the women who participated in it. She argues:

Dating the beginning of the fight for pure food and drugs after the turn of the twentieth century is clearly too late. Politicians, bureaucrats, and journalists of the early 1900s often wrote of food and drug adulteration as if it were their exclusive discovery. They also say the

pure food, drink, and drug law as the recent fruit of their influence with the legislature and their own efforts in alerting a hitherto disinterested public to the extent of adulteration and fraud. The reverse is nearer the truth. The law was passed by Congress following a long and bitter consumer struggle that politicians and journalists took up only after organized women had laid the infrastructure.²⁵²

²⁴⁹See *id.* at 185 (describing Dr. Wiley’s “conversion” of Federation reformer Alice Lakey). *But see id.* at 210 (suggesting that Dr. Wiley “considered the Senate vote also a ‘victory of the women of this country’”).

²⁵¹See, *e.g.*, *id.* at 179.

She is also highly critical of Dr. Wiley, suggesting that “one of Wiley’s greatest personal weaknesses was his insistence on preserving credit for himself.”²⁵³ She continues:

He enjoyed the reputation of being the ‘father’ of pure food and drugs, took delight in claiming that consumers were indifferent to food adulteration before he aroused public opinion, avoided any suggestion that he had espoused a ‘women’s issue,’ and chose not

to share credit for the initiation and growth of the crusade with ‘organized motherhood’ or women’s clubs.²⁵⁴

Good Housekeeping’s coverage of the pure food issue supports the Ms. Goodwin’s assertion that women were committed to the campaign for pure food, drink, and drugs long before the turn of the century. As this paper has shown, *Good Housekeeping* – a publication that targeted middle-class housewives – published articles about the pure food problem right from its inception in 1885.²⁵⁵

The magazine praised women for their contribution to the pure food movement. In April 1903, Marion MacBride lauded women’s clubs for their efforts to secure national legislation: “Women have brought about many reforms, and since 1898 they have worked with a will for a national pure food law. The National Woman’s Christian Temperance union, the General Federation of women’s clubs and the National Congress of Mothers have been at work, all over this country, for [a federal pure food bill].”²⁵⁶ Notably, Ms. MacBride may have revealed how *women* viewed Dr. Wiley’s so-called mobilization efforts, describing Dr. Wiley and

²⁵³Id. at 224.

²⁵⁵See *supra* II.A.

²⁵⁶Marion A. MacBride, *Women Working for Pure Food*, 36 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Apr. 1903, at 364.

A.C. True – also of the Department of Agriculture—as “our helpers.”²⁵⁷ Along similar lines, L.D. Gibbs squarely credited women with the passage of the federal pure food law.²⁵⁸

Furthermore, *Good Housekeeping* was anything but shy about taking credit for its own efforts. In an August 1906 article, the magazine unabashedly claimed that its own efforts had rescued the national pure food bill from defeat: “The ringing call in our July issue, stating the situation in all its shameful absurdity, reached our lawmakers at the crucial moment and had largely to do with this sudden rallying of the two houses of congress to the demand of the American home.”²⁵⁹ Several months later, another author reiterated this idea: “The success of this legislation, when every effort had been made to encompass its defeat, is partly due to *Good Housekeeping’s* onslaught in its May, June and especially its July numbers, and more especially to the work of the Pure Food League.”²⁶⁰

Conclusion

This paper has sought to add to our knowledge about a broad social movement by closely examining an individual publication’s approach to the issue over more than two decades. In addition to making a very small but hopefully valuable contribution to the body of archival data about the pure food, drink, and drug movement of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, this analysis has illustrated

²⁵⁷ *Id.*

²⁵⁸ Gibbs, *supra* note 234.

²⁵⁹ *The Federal Pure Food Law*, *supra* note 127, at 225.

²⁶⁰ *The Pure Food League*, 43 GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, Oct. 1906, at 404 – 08, 404.

some of the more important dimensions to women's participation in that movement. Furthermore, this paper has offered evidence that far from simply being drafted into the pure food campaign in the few years immediately prior to the 1906 Act, many American women were actively interested in the problem of pure food and working to solve it for many years beforehand.